

VOLUME 8.

NUMBER 1.

PRICE 1/-.

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for January, 1967

AUSTRALIAN OUTLOOK

B. A. Santamaria

ETHIOPIA IN TRANSITION

Czeslaw Jesman

DRUG KIDS

Paul Crane, S.J.

EUROPE AGAIN ?

J. M. Jackson

CHANGE IN RELIGION

Vincent Rochford

DANGER ! WOMEN AT WORK

E. L. Way

CBF

v.8
1967
Contents

Page

1 TWO POPES
The Editor

2 ETHIOPIA IN TRANSITION
Czeslaw Jesman

10 THE CHRISTIAN LIFE: CHANGE
IN RELIGION
Vincent Rochford

15 CURRENT COMMENT: PIUS XII AND
THE NAZIS: 2.
The Editor

25 DANGER! WOMEN AT WORK
E. L. Way

30 MONTHLY REPORT: AUSTRALIAN
OUTLOOK: 1
B. A. Santamaria

41 INDUSTRIAL ANGLE: EUROPE AGAIN?
J. M. Jackson

47 ANY QUESTIONS ?
William Lawson, SJ

54 THE CHURCH AT WORK: LOVE IN
ACTION. CREDIT UNIONS AND THE
CHURCH.
J. van den Dries

60 BOOK REVIEW
Paul Crane, SJ

IF YOU CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS:

If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Furnival St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by The Record Press Ltd., Emmet Road, Bray.
Annual subscription: one year, fifteen shillings; in the U.S.A. and Canada three dollars; in Australia twenty-one shillings; postage paid.

Those who previously bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 15/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,
43 Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 8.

JANUARY, 1967

NUMBER 1.

TWO POPES

THE EDITOR

WITHIN a few months of his death the reputation of Pope Pius XII went into something close to eclipse. The reason is to be found, I believe, not only in the strongly contrasted personality of his successor, but in the misinterpretation placed by an accommodating and permissive world on the character of John XXIII. It suited the Pope to itself. Pius XII did not suit: that is why the world looks down its nose at his memory. Many of the expressions of love which surround the memory of John XXIII are, I am afraid, only disguised expressions of human weakness. The skilled diplomat and unflinching defender of moral right in a world of shattered values has been contrasted unfavourably with the intensely loveable old man, who went out to the world with his arms wide open and invited mankind to share his embrace. Overnight, it has been forgotten that great men in the Church are made by God for their times and that John XXIII might have found it very difficult to cope with the sea of troubles—war and its dreadful aftermath—which deluged the pontificate of Pius XII. Pius, similarly, might have been uncomfortable and ill at ease had it been his lot to preside over the Second Vatican Council. I doubt whether it would even have entered his mind to call it. Delegation did not come easily to his nature. He held much in his own hands throughout his pontificate. Viewing the problems of his time, wise men will be glad that he did. The contrast between the two Popes is striking; but I fail to see that it gives either any claim to moral superiority over the other. Certainly, neither of them would ever have made it. All the contrast proves, so far as I can see, is the unending care of God for his Church.

An easy religious and racial tolerance, a tingling feeling of adventure at being the leading nation of Africa, a sense of limitless horizons, a beautiful capital city that unfolds like a flower, all these and more are described here.

Ethiopia in Transition

CZESLAW JESMAN

ADDIS ABABA, the capital of Ethiopia, means in Amharic, the national language of the country, "New Flower". And indeed the impression which strikes most forcibly any traveller who visits it after an absence of some years is its quality of growth. It is as though seeds of an organic development, planted there almost a century ago broke suddenly to the surface after a long, and often painful germination.

Religious Toleration

Today the Ethiopian capital is, in a way, several things at the same time. It is a spacious modern capital with all the usual features of a huge urban centre: hospitals, banks, civic buildings, ministries, modern hotels and night clubs, private residences and apartment houses. Schools and various departments of the Haile Selassie I University have proliferated. And so have churches of all denominations, since complete religious toleration is not only guaranteed by the 1955 Constitution, but is observed in everyday life. There are mosques for a fairly numerous Moslem minority, both indigenous, the so-called *Jiberti*, and migrant: the Arabs, Yemeni and others, the Somalis and many other Moslem races of the "Erythrean" Coast of North East Africa, live and trade, and go about their business in the capital of the oldest Christian state of the continent and of the world, unhampered and undisturbed. Which, incidentally, is not invariably the fate of Christians, of whatever extraction, in at least some Moslem African capitals. There are, for example, several almost exclusively Somali towns of Ethiopia, and the Somali traders operate, collecting incense, as far as the northern approaches of the Governorate General of

Eritrea, one of the 14 major divisions of the Ethiopian Empire. There are no Christian settlements of any kind, and least of all Ethiopian, in the truculently Moslem Republic of Somalia.

But to return to Addis Ababa. Some twenty years ago it still was a rather accidental collection of indigenous huts and nondescript modern houses. Only the Imperial Residence—the *Ghebbi*—had an individual style, the Palace, which became since the main body of the National University and a dozen of churches. The latter abandoned mostly their traditional circular form but had not yet acquired at the time an individuality of their own. The wilderness of the North-Eastern highland plateau of the Horn of Africa was hardly affected by the bodily existence of the Ethiopian capital on the slopes of the Entoto Range.

Limitless Horizons

The landscape turned green during the two rainy seasons, and dun-coloured and parched for the rest of the year. The limitless horizons of Africa still open in every direction around Addis Ababa, but the ancient, seasonal rotation of the colour scheme no longer obtains. The neighbourhood of the capital on some 30 or 40 miles perimeter is now covered with the ever expanding vegetations: eucalyptus groves alternate with lush fields under intensive cultivation. Farms thrive, and experimental plantations of conifers. The land is perennially green. The soil is incredibly fertile. It laid fallow for several centuries, ever since the Moslems under Mohammed Granj, the "Lefthanded", devastated it in the first half of the 16th century, and now, that the vegetation has finally taken roots again, it virtually blooms. In the course of the last ten years sizeable forests have grown in the erstwhile deserts.

Addis Ababa is today one of the few capitals where new trees are as much in evidence as new buildings. New alleys lit at night with street lamps of futuristic design spread in every direction. Modern buildings, often of considerable merit, grow in a matter of months. But the humble hutments are razed to the ground only when it is inevitable. This does not entail chaos, it merely adds a touch of humanity to grand planning. The Ethiopians accept life as an inevitable mixture of the good and the bad, of the rich and of the poor. The opposite live side by side within the same framework of social usage with little envy or contempt. The

instinctive good manners obtain among the poor as well as among the rich. This is of particular significance since within the last couple of years Addis Ababa has become in many respects the capital of the African continent. It is the seat of the Organisation of African Unity, brought about three years ago by the decision of Emperor Haile Selassie I in response to the generally felt, but inchoate feeling throughout the continent. The United Nations' Economic Commission for Africa is also based in Addis, and most African countries have their embassies there. Their number is steadily growing. Some of the newly sovereign African nations are aggressively reformist; others are impatient with the inescapable lags of time and frailties of human nature. But the mood of the Ethiopian capital soothes and calms down all of them. In Ethiopia, an understatement, a jocular reference to serious subjects, and with a serious intent spring from millennial traditions of the Ethiopian civilisations. Its roots antedate the implanting of Christianity there by several centuries. And it should be borne in mind that the Ethiopian sovereign and his court at least were Christians by the second half of the 4th century A.D., and corresponded on "dear cousin" terms with the immediate successors of Constantine the Great of Rome.

Tact and Political Sense

The recent crisis over Rhodesia and the outburst of anti-British feelings among some delegations gathered in Addis Ababa on an emergency session to deal with the sanctions against the rebel administration of Smith in Salisbury provided an excellent opportunity for Ethiopian tact and innate political sense. The Ethiopians are profoundly conscious of their African identity. They are well aware, that, ultimately, their fate is closely bound with the destinies of the continent. The fact that their own civilisation is infinitely older and more variegated than the heritage of most of the newly emergent African nations adds rather to their consciousness of their "all-continental" responsibilities. Their instinct of statemanship, or "loose-rein" administrative methods, of hitting upon a practical formula in dealing with irreconcilable points of view is invaluable in the current phase of stress and readjustment in Africa. They act as peacemakers, even though the Communist-inspired and patently mendacious fable of "Amhara tyranny" is trotted out against the Ethiopian government in some African capitals each

time the Ethiopian instinct of bringing a measure of order into distressing difficulties of emergent nations is brought to the fore. Yet for all the frontier difficulties of their own with the intractable Somalis, aided and abetted by the Russians and President Nasser in their anachronistic political dreams of incorporating all neighbouring territories, belonging to other nations as long as any Somalis are living there or migrating across them, the Ethiopians in modern Africa act as natural peacemakers. Thus, for example, the Emperor of Ethiopia not only has acted as an arbitrator in a bitter frontier feud between Algeria and Morocco, two Moslem lands, a couple of years ago, but his arbitration brought about a durable settlement of a very thorny problem.

A Passing Temptation

The "Panafrican" sentiment in Addis Ababa is but one of the entirely new features of it which is likely to thrive and expand. Another is the absorption of its foreign element. It has enriched it, but has not altered its profoundly indigenous character. Yet there was a stage, not such a long time ago, when it almost seemed that the rising generation of young Ethiopians were ready to push their own, inimitable and highly idiosyncratic cultural heritage into the background, to let it wilt and perish. They were under the double impact of having lost the war with Italy in 1935-6 and having won yet another war five years later against the same enemy which brought back freedom. Rather understandably they chalked up both the defeat and the victory to technical means only. They were under the same delusion as the shabby "generalissimo" of Communist Russia when he asked sneeringly how many divisions the Holy See had at its command so that it should have any say in international affairs. Of course the trend of reasoning in both cases was different: but the Ethiopians who have survived foreign occupation and saw its disintegration were rather too apt to link their troubles and their triumphs with the purely material aspects of any human struggle. This was, of course, only a delusion—temptation would be, perhaps, a better term—and it has passed,

French and Italian Influence

Today foreigners, technocrats or beachcombers, traders or political agents, cease to signify. The French influence was strong some seventy years ago at the Ethiopian court. To

this day people of quality throughout the land speak French without a trace of foreign accent. The Italian occupation, hostile and bitterly resented and violently opposed had lasted only five years. It never encompassed the whole country. Pockets of patriotic guerrillas were no mere invention of the late Mrs. Sylvia Pankhurst when, from London, she led single-handed and impecunious a press warfare for Ethiopia and against Mussolini and his legions. To this day there are remote sections of Ethiopia where no Italian administrator ever set foot, let alone imposed his will. Yet, today, barely a generation after these tragic events there is no rancour and no festering memories. The large Italian community in Ethiopia [some 25,000 all told], are perhaps the Europeans who get along best with the Ethiopians, and have the best *rapport* with them in personal and business level. Some of the Italian *entrepreneurs*, like Avv, Consiglio of Rome, or Commendatore Petinelli of Addis Ababa have played a vital part in the economic re-establishment of the country in the late fifties and ever since. Many outstanding buildings in new Addis Ababa have been designed by Italian architects. A neon light advertisement in the heart of the capital illustrates admirably the newly found formula of Ethiopian-Italian symbiosis: it says in Amharic and English "Drink Beer produced by an Italian firm". Numerous *caffè-espresso* and shoe-shines, and the careless elegance of clothes-conscious young generation of Ethiopia are of Italian inspiration. There is an obverse to the picture: the Italian community in the Governorate General of Eritrea, some 18,000 strong, rather illogically continues in the tradition of obsolete colonialism. Not that they dream, or could dream of re-establishment of the crumbled order. But there is an anachronistic insistence on past glories: the main centre in Asmara, the capital of Eritrea is "Casa d'italia", the *Liceo*, paid for by the Italian Government, is *Liceo Martini*, named after one of the best Italian administrators of the land under colonial dispensation. Things like this crop up everywhere. They are puerile, and could become an irritant. Everybody knows that Eritrea was under Italian domination for over 60 years, and that they brought a measure of economic development to it. But why rub it in under different conditions? The "Casa d'italia" could be much better called "Casa Dante Aligheri", and *Liceo Martini* would cut a better figure as *Liceo Benedetto Croce*. Without Italy we would all be sad barbarians scratching our woad-painted sides with

broken pottery; we all know that. But a provincial, straight-laced and lip-pursed provincial Italian town is anything but a power house of higher culture. The other day the *Corriere della Sera* of Milan published an editorial on how the Italians who are among the best dressed people in the world as civilians look all puffed up and incongruous in uniforms. A high Ethiopian official in Asmara despaired: "We need the Italians — he said — artists, poets, men of inspiration. Instead all we have got are the *impiegatucci*—lesser clerks—money makers and *zabanyas*—which in Amharic means a servant or a night watchman, and could be extended to all menial employees—we have all of them aplenty of our own".

The Italian loan to Ethiopia—some 15 m. dollars at 3.5 per cent repayable in 20 years—is in the final stages. It will be negotiated. It is to be hoped that it will not centre on Eritrea and its fossilised memories of recondite glories, and on the *zabanyas*.

Adapt to Survive

The process of adjustment of the foreign element, or of communities, in Ethiopia is infinite and each deserves a special study. All of them, in order to survive, must now adapt themselves to local requirements. A generation ago they felt, instinctively, by reason of their superior technical knowledge that they could impose their individual tastes and customs upon the infinitely older and tolerant pattern of their hosts. At the receptions at the Imperial Palace during the reign of Empress Zawditu, the predecessor of the Emperor Haile Selassie I, on annual receptions at Easter, and other traditional festivals each foreign community, including the "White" Russians had their own "tables" and their own stands, as it were. Today, if a foreigner seeks an audience with the Emperor his credentials must be impeccable, his behaviour appropriate and he must abide by the protocol, ancient yet relaxed, which obtains at the Court of Solomonic Throne.

Coca-Cola, Tweeds, and Soviet Cars

English tweeds, American Coca-Cola, Yugoslav wines and manufacturers of all kinds could be obtained in Ethiopia today, as well as Japanese transistors and, at least according to the advertisement disfiguring the landscape along the main arteries, Soviet cars. But they are all woven into the Ethiopian context; not superimposed on it and drawing

sustenance from it on their own terms.

As it is today the best Ethiopian painter Iskander Bogosian is of part Armenian extraction, and so are some of the officers of the Imperial Guards, his kinsmen. There are Ethiopian and part Italian landed gentry of aristocratic Tuscan antecedents and there is at least one distinguished Ethiopian family by the name of Babitchev. They are the descendants of a Dragoons' Officer of the Imperial Russian Army. He was sent to Ethiopia on an official mission some eighty years ago, stayed on and married a local lady of quality. Subsequently his sons and grandsons occupied eminent positions in various fields and one of them became one of the first Ethiopian envoys to the Soviet Union after World War II.

Addis Ababa

• If one stays in Addis Ababa for any length of time one falls increasingly under its spell! The very name of the city bears out the meaning of its name: it unfolds harmoniously, not unlike a flower, in every direction. It has not been conjured up, like say, St. Petersburg out of the chilly marshes of Gulf of Finland, by a whim of a despot. It came about under the pressure of economic and political necessity. Addis Ababa was chosen as the capital of the renovated Ethiopian Empire by Menelik II, not merely because it was situated near the natural, hot, and health giving springs of Filoka, beloved by *Itege Taitu*, the Empress of Menelik. It was also the geographical centre of the Ethiopian Empire. Its immediate vicinity consisted of some of the richest areas of the African continent. In our days its agricultural survey has merely started. Only few of the rivers crossing it, the ancient Kingdom of Shoa, have been dammed and regulated. Given time and opportunity this central core of the Ethiopian state could feed many more millions than the present population of the Empire, reckoned at some 22 to 25 million. The good start has been made in the overall planning of the development of the Awash Valley.

Sense of Achievement

It would not be possible without a "technological breakthrough". The Ethiopians have proved in the course of the last decade, to everybody's satisfaction and their own, which is by far the most important factor in the scheme, that, if

their heart is in it, they can be excellent doctors, engineers and pilots. The national Ethiopian Air Lines have one of the best records for safety and reliability in the world. They operate on the principle "better be late but safe" and they are practically never late. Today, on its twentieth anniversary about 85 per cent of the pilots of the Ethiopian Air Lines are Ethiopians. Originally they were sponsored by the TWA of the United States.

The sense of achievement in so many fields of technology has permitted the Ethiopian to shed the protective coating of self-induced inadequacy. They cheerfully admit that in many fields they still have a lot to learn; particularly since they have already learned in so many others. They have no wish to "over-reach and surpass America", and are first to acknowledge that they need, at this moment, and most urgently the U.S. Peace Corps Volunteers as well as the technical School built by the Soviet Union at Bahar Dar on the Lake Tana, the heart of the realm.

Of course everything is not, nor could it be, perfect in Ethiopia. But land there is in abundance, and the sense of freedom, and the tingling urge of adventure, and the comforting realisation of the continuity of its institutional Monarchy has steered clear of numerous and obvious rocks of sudden changes and revolutionary upheavals under the leaderships of Emperor Haile Selassie I. Constitutional reforms are being introduced slowly and without violence: since last Easter Ethiopia has its first responsible cabinet Government. Above all there is a spirit of optimism, and joy and creativity in the air. Addis Ababa—the New Flower of Africa—is blossoming; a fitting symbol of its ancient yet constantly renovating land. The land, to quote John Betjeman, exhales.

Fact & Fiction

"In a novel, the author gives the leading character intelligence and distinction. Fate goes to less trouble: mediocrities play a part in great events simply from happening to be there."—Talleyrand.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

We must not hang on to a way of thinking and acting merely because this was the way our ancestors thought and acted. This is to make of tradition a dead and not a living thing. Tradition is rich enough to contain insights not available at once, or easily, to any single generation.

Change in Religion

VINCENT ROCHFORD

A GROUP of men immersed in the world must react to many situations. It cannot remain immobile, or it will perish. The outstanding example in history of this process is the Byzantine empire; indeed it has given the word byzantinism to our language. Situations change, they constitute a challenge which must be faced. And in facing them a community or institution itself changes.

This happened in the life of the Hebrew people as of any other. They wore a very different aspect in the days of Solomon's mercantile empire from what they had been in the wilderness three centuries earlier. They had learned to till land and become farmers. They possessed and used money. They were in close contact with other races, cultures and languages. They went into battle with accoutrements suited to the needs of the battlefield. In other words they had developed; the very need for survival had taught them to study and learn from their neighbours and to resemble them. This brought perils in its train as well as advantages; but they survived.

Side by side with this went a growth in religious maturity. The events of their history provoked reflection, recurrent tendencies towards idolatry and the fertility cults showed the need for self-criticism and for a return to the sources of their religion. Indeed, large sections of their sacred books were revised and additions which brought the Law into touch with the needs of their day were incorporated into the text, and are to be found in our bibles today.

In the desert it had been natural for them, keeping away

from any relations with other nations, to look on Yahweh as their own tribal god. Their subsequent history did not permit this, and some five hundred years later they had learned from the prophets that even though a unique covenant relationship existed between Yahweh and themselves, nevertheless he was the one true God, God of all men and all nations. They came to perceive, at least dimly, that his concern for men was universal, and that it would eventually express itself through them, his chosen people, and through Jerusalem and its Temple.

There was, too, moral development. Pride in their marvellous Temple, scrupulous care over the sacrifices that were offered in it, did not suffice as the response to God's loving kindness; it had to express itself, outside the ritual and cultic demands of their Law, in pity for the widow and the orphan. The prophets hammered away at these themes with different degrees of success: for, as we know ourselves, official worship comes very much easier to us than a genuine concern for our neighbours. It is a pitfall for religious people, endemic in all ages.

Development within the Church

The same law of development guides the growth of the Church. Truths that lay implicit in the teaching of the apostles gradually come to the full light of day. Historic situations call for change of emphasis: for instance Luther's insistence on an invisible church and on the priesthood of all Christians, exaggerated as it was, called for stressing of the Church as institution, visible and organic; and of the importance of the sacrament of Order. Then the situation changes; Luther is long dead, denial that Our Lord left behind him a visible community charged with perpetuating his own presence and his mission, is rare; rather the whole need of a Church, its relevance, or even that of the Saviour, is doubted or denied. In these circumstances it becomes helpful rather to learn once again to see the Church as the new people of God, and this the Vatican Council has put before us.

In the same way the old method of celebrating the eucharist, grown into little more (it appeared) than a private action of a priest in the presence of a crowd of believers, was seen to be unhelpful to the people and indeed conducive to a wrong impression of our worship. So there again the Council went back to the source and restored the community-aspect of

our worship. These were but two moves towards reform and renewal of Catholic life.

Opposition . . .

Among the Jews, the leaders of the *aggiornamento* met with bitter opposition. Every prophet experienced it. To seek to develop tradition appeared as an attack on tradition. New insights, the effort to apply God's Law to new sets of circumstances, appeared to jaundiced eyes as treachery to God and to the Covenant.

And this was the attitude that gave rise to the hatred against Jesus. The leaders who persecuted him and brought him to his death were not just bad men. They were religious men: sincere men. Men who carried out the Law in all its minute regulations. They fasted rigorously, they were generous to the Temple, they read the scrolls. They were educated. They were respectable. Yet they resisted him who came, not to abolish the Law, but to bring it to perfection.

It is probable that this opposition rose out of an unreasoning attachment to tradition. Clearly the truth that has been handed down, whether it be the Covenant of Sinai and its attendant legislation for the Jews, or whether it be the New Covenant of Jesus Christ with its great law of love, must be jealously safeguarded, no distortions, no novelties allowed to intrude. Such was the attitude of St. Paul, and is our own.

Yet it is possible to remain attached to a set of ideas merely on the ground that one's grandparents and their grandparents, held the same—and for no other reason. This is irrational. It is to make of tradition a dead instead of a living thing. And it impoverishes tradition, not understanding that it is rich enough to contain insights not available, all of them, at once to the perception of any single generation, insights which must be won only by prayer, by reflection, by the very act of living them out.

And so it was that some men opposed the promised Messiah when he came, through a stupid and unreasoning slavery to dead tradition.

Do such attitudes not threaten us who are members of the new people of God?

Whose Religion?

A second motive was this: some men had convinced

themselves that they knew all there was to be known about their Jewish faith. They knew all the answers. Indeed, they had come to think of it as "our religion". It belonged, they thought, to them. It was their property, their possession: and anyone who threatened their security was a serious danger to them and to it.

And here came this Jesus, interfering with the very decalogue, insisting that it covered even the internal dispositions of men; questioning their motives, they who were "good Jews"; minimising the importance of the Sabbath rules; mixing with those whom decent society rejected, whose presence and company it found intolerable, proclaiming a kingdom in which there would be no room for sacrifices nor even of their Temple !

This section was betrayed by a bourgeois attitude, an attitude of possession, of jealous care for their own property—forgetting that Yahweh's revelation did not belong to them, but was a gift coming from him, his property, not theirs, belonging to him but offered to them, and in no way their own.

Catholic Attitudes

Did these weaknesses of the human mind die out with the Pharisees? Or are they a constant in human beings, demanding to be unearthed and resisted in every religion and in each generation? Is it not true that sectors within the Church resist to this day the decisions of the Vatican Council, simply because of an unthinking attachment to the past? Because, this was what my grandparents and their grandparents were used to—and it cannot, must not, change!

All this, where it exists, reveals an inadequate understanding of the Church, and, incidentally, the dangers of seeing the Church too much in terms of an institution, of an age-old building which weathers all storms and does not change. It fails to appreciate that the Church is a People that has to grow, the Body of Christ that must adapt to its environment, that from its rich resources must offer its own children and those outside an image which their mentality allows them to understand.

Again, opposition or apathy in this crisis through which both world and Church are passing, comes from a selfish attitude towards it. It is "MY religion, MY faith, MY Church". But it isn't. It is God's. We can only very humbly accept what God offers, and, sinners as we are, make the

best of it, seeing ourselves as unprofitable servants, maybe, but anyway as servants.

I may like the Latin tongue, highly civilised and beautiful as it is, when compared with the emasculated and impoverished English of our day. But I have to ask myself whether the Word of God is to be proclaimed in a beautiful but incomprehensible language, or whether in a comparatively ugly translation which is still intelligible and capable of conveying the message of God to his people?

And so with all the changes initiated by the Vatican Council. It is a call to religious sincerity, to the conviction that the Catholic Church exists to make Christ present in the world, to render God's saving love accessible to humanity; that everything which the Church's leaders judge helpful to this must be accepted and supported by all the power and influence at our command. Selfishness and apathy must not be allowed to hinder the great work of reform and renewal by one iota. The Church exists for Jesus Christ: not for me.

Two Forms of Ownership

"In the teaching of Pius XII a distinction between two forms of ownership emerges. On the one hand *personal and family ownership*, closely linked with the human person and, on the other, the larger forms of *capitalist ownership*. In both cases the Pope maintained the principle. But he vigorously denounced the abuses of the second category. It was in this sense that he condemned capitalism is "contrary to the natural law". 'Wherever capitalism is based on false ideas and assumes a limitless right over its own property, without admitting any subordination to the common good, the Church has always condemned it as contrary to the natural law' " (*Pope Pius XII, Radio Message, 1st September, 1944.) Mgr. Guerry—*The Social Teaching of the Church*, p. 81.

CURRENT COMMENT

It is a fact that Pope Pius XII made no public and specific protest against the Nazi attempt to exterminate the Jews. Why was this so? Father Paul Crane gives his answer to this question in the second of two articles arising out of a reading of Professor Saul Friedlander's recent book.

Pius XII and the Nazis: 2

THE EDITOR

LAST month I tried to show that little credence can be given to the thesis of Professor Saul Friedlander, based on his selection of available documents, that the hope of Pope Pius XII for a Nazi victory over Bolshevism in World War II was the cause of his "silence" in the face of Nazi atrocities, particularly those perpetrated against the Jewish people.

Public Protest in General

Nevertheless, it does remain true that the Pope made no specific and public protest against Hitler's attempted extermination of the Jews. The fact, says Sir Alec Randall, "is not in dispute"⁽¹⁾. We are not saying here that the Pope did not protest publicly and in general terms against Hitler's Jewish persecution. This he did on two occasions, so far as I know. The first was in his Christmas Message of 1941. It contains the following passage: "Mankind owes this promise (to return to God's law) to the hundreds of thousands who were personally innocent but, purely on account of their nationality or race, were condemned to death or to a progressive deterioration of their condition". Then, there is the address to the Sacred College on June 2nd, 1943, in which Pius XII said: "You will not be surprised beloved sons and brothers, if we listen, deeply moved to sympathy, to the cries of those who, with hearts full of anxiety, have turned to us. These are the people who, on account of their nationality or their race, have been beset

(1) *The Pope, the Jews, and the Nazis*; CTS, 9d., p. 14.

by ever-increasing disaster, tortured by ever more bitter and severe pains and, without any fault on their part, been subjected to such measures as must mean their extermination". Finally, we may cite, once again, the passage in the broadcast over Vatican Radio to the French people in June, 1943, to the effect that "he who makes a distinction between Jews and other men is unfaithful to God and is in conflict with God's demands". The condemnation of Hitler's racial policy and hence of the persecution of the Jews is clear enough in all these three instances.

Why no Specific Pronouncement ?

What we still have to examine, however, is why there was no public pronouncement from the Pope specifically against the Nazis because of their attempted extermination of the Jewish people. It is clear that Pius XII knew about this. Why, then, did he not protest against it openly and by name? A clue is provided in a further passage from the address to the College of Cardinals on June 2nd, 1943: "Every word that we addressed to the responsible authorities and every one of our public declarations had to be seriously pondered and considered, in the interest of the persecuted themselves, so as not, unwittingly, to make the situation still harder and more intolerable". In other words, the Holy Father is acting on the very sane and humane principle that, if the effect of public and specific protest against Nazi atrocity was likely to worsen the lot of the victims and, even, increase their number, then it was better to refrain from making it. That this was, almost certainly, his mind on the matter is shown in a significant passage from a letter to Archbishop von Preysing of Berlin, written a month earlier on April 30th, 1943, and quoted *in extenso* by Professor Friedlander. The passage appears on page 139 of his book, *Pius XII and the Third Reich*. It runs as follows: "So far as episcopal declarations are concerned, we leave to pastors on the spot the task of assessing whether, and to what extent, the danger of reprisals and pressures and, perhaps, other circumstances due to the length and psychological climate of the war, counsel restraint—despite reasons that might exist for intervention—in order to avoid greater evils. This is one of the motives for the limitations which we impose on ourself in our declarations. The experience we gained in 1942, when we allowed papal documents to be

freely reproduced for the use of Catholics, justifies our attitude, so far as we can see”.

Envoy in Disguise

Reference here is almost certainly to documents sent to Cardinal Sapieha, Archbishop of Cracow in Poland, in the early part of 1942. Fresh light was thrown on this incident by the Auxiliary Bishop of Munich in a speech to a meeting of the Kolping Association in Munich in mid-October, 1963. The story has been told in *The Tablet* for October 26th, 1963. It is well worth quoting in full:

“New evidence throwing light on possible Nazi reactions had Pius XII openly condemned their treatment of the Jews was provided by Bishop Neuhausler, Auxiliary of Munich, in a speech to a meeting of the Kolping organisation in Munich on Monday last week. The evidence comes from two priests who in 1942 smuggled papal statements on the Nazi reign of terror into Poland: Father Joseph Kaul, garrison chaplain in Cracow in 1941 and 1942; and Mgr. Quirino Paganuzzi, now Maestro di Camera to Pope Paul.

“Father Kaul says that in the early part of 1942 he had arranged for Mgr. Paganuzzi to meet Cardinal Sapieha, Archbishop of Cracow until his death in 1951: this meeting was arranged at the urgent request of the Italian priest, who at first referred to himself simply as Quirino and as having accompanied an Italian hospital train provided by the Order of Malta. Father Kaul goes on: ‘It was only inside the bishop’s residence that Quirino revealed himself as a papal envoy: he first of all handed the archbishop an autograph letter from the Holy Father. The archbishop read it with tears of joy in his eyes. Then Quirino reached into his briefcase once again and brought out a thick packet which he handed to the archbishop. When the archbishop had broken the seal and opened the packet, I saw that it consisted of printed encyclicals (*Rundschreiben*) of Pius XII, written in Polish, with the main theme the ‘philosophical exposition and refutation of National Socialism’. The Cardinal took one in his hands and began to read it. Suddenly he swept his hands together over his head, dropped the encyclical and cried out: ‘For heaven’s sake! It is impossible for me to pass this encyclical of His Holiness on to my clergy, far less make it known to my Polish people. One copy in the hands of the SD (*Sicherheitsdienst* — security

services) and our heads will roll and the Catholic Church in Poland is lost. Doesn't the Holy Father know how things are with us? This encyclical must be burnt at once'. And with that he threw the whole packet into the fire.

"Mgr. Paganuzzi's testimony is as follows: 'I still recall Cardinal Sapieha's expression of alarm, and he was anything but a fearful man. The envelopes had been given to me by Samore, who was then a Monsignor. His Eminence Cardinal Maglione (Vatican Secretary of State, died in 1944) gave me more letters that he had written with his own hand and concerning which he ordered the utmost secrecy. I remember well how I talked to Cardinal Sapieha about the tragic removal of the Jews from the ghetto to another district of the city (most probably to the extermination camp at Treblinka), something I myself had only been able to observe with horror, and how the archbishop ended with these words: 'If I could at least comfort you by telling you that I told all these unfortunates of the sympathy which the Pope and the Holy See share in their martyrdom . . . The situation is the same for all Poles. They think they are neglected and abandoned by Rome, when it is a fact that we bishops cannot publicly make known the messages and the encouragement of the Pope in order not to expose our people to greater retaliatory measures and still heavier chains on the part of the German troops and the German political police'."

The Professor is not Interested

(Professor Friedlander makes no reference to this incident in his book. Charity compels me to assume that he knows nothing of it as yet. Otherwise, one would have to assume that this reference is omitted because the incident does so much to destroy his theory that Pius XII maintained silence in the face of Nazi atrocity so as not to weaken the Nazi effort against Communist Russia. If ever there was a time for maintaining silence, in accordance with this theory, this was it, yet the Pope chose precisely this time to offer for publication an encyclical written in Polish, having for its theme a "philosophical exposition and refutation of National Socialism".)

The Dutch get it Worse

The other experience, I imagine, of which Pius XII had knowledge and which he had in mind when he wrote to

Archbishop von Preysing, was that of the Dutch Bishops in mid-1942. In the words of *Social Survey*, our Australian contemporary⁽²⁾:

"The experience of the Dutch Hierarchy in the same year shows that such a fear was far from empty. The Bishops had protested against the arrest of Jews in Holland, and immediately afterwards—in direct reprisal—the SS stepped up their anti-Jewish activities. They also rounded up every priest, monk and nun who had any 'Jewish blood' whatever and deported them to concentration camps. Protestant Christians of Jewish origins were not touched at this time because Protestant clergy had decided that a protest would be imprudent".

The article goes on: "The impact of these experiences was reinforced in the flat language of official communication in 1943 when the German Foreign Minister, von Ribbentrop, wrote the following instructions to Rome: 'Should the Vatican either politically or by propaganda oppose Germany, it should be made unmistakably clear that a worsening of relations between Germany and the Vatican would not at all have an adverse effect on Germany alone. On the contrary, the German Government would have sufficient effective propaganda material as well as retaliatory measures at its disposal to counteract each attempted move by the Vatican'."

The International Red Cross

In other words, public and specific protest was a futile business, certain to do more harm than good, and no one knew it better than Pius XII. Under the circumstances, he took the only course open in conscience, I would say, to any human being. He refrained from public and specific protest and did his utmost to help the victims of Nazi persecution in every other way open to him. It is interesting to note that the International Red Cross did the same thing. So far as I know, their action has not since been criticised. Here is the comment of a member of their Committee: "An official protest against the persecution of the Jews is being demanded of us. How should we do that? Switzerland is surrounded by National Socialist dominated territory. If we were to protest, Hitler would denounce the Geneva Convention and we would have to give up all our work for prisoners of war, both Allied and German, also our work for those in

⁽²⁾ "Pius XII on Trial" by W. G. Smith, S.J.; May, 1964.

distress and for the civilian internees in the occupied territories. Thank God, an official protest was turned down after very long discussions. It was a terribly difficult decision for us, but now, at any rate, we can continue our work"(³). Exactly.

Writers' Support for the Pope

Prominent writers and commentators have supported the Pope's attitude, which was that of a man compassionate enough to place his pity for the persecuted above any consideration of personal prestige, which would have prompted one less strong-willed to "publish and be damned", irrespective of the frightful vengeance which Nazi brutality would have wreaked on those whose chalice of pain and anguish was already full to overflowing. It is, I hope, not typical of Hochhuth, author of *The Representative*, that he should have quoted only one half of Francois Mauriac's judgment: "We did not have the consolation of seeing the successor of the Galilean Simon Peter unequivocally and clearly, and not without diplomatic allusions, condemning the crucifixion of these innumerable 'brothers of the Lord'". Hochhuth omitted what follows. Here is the rest of what Mauriac said: "The silence of the Pope and the hierarchy was nothing but a terrible duty; it was a question of avoiding something worse"(⁴). The verdict of Poliakov-Wulff, Author of *The Third Reich and the Jews* and a Jewish research historian, is in the same direction: "One must realise that public protests would have resulted in merciless counter-measures. What would have been the result of an official condemnation by the highest authority in the Catholic Church? What the immediate and practical results would have been for the Catholic Church and for the Jews themselves is a question which one would not dare to answer"(⁵). And, a little more grudgingly, perhaps, Leon Poliakov, leading Jewish authority on persecution and Nazism, has this to say: "It is painful to have to say that all through the war, while the death-factories ran at full blast, the Papacy kept silent. However, it should be recognised that public protests

(³) Quoted in CTS Leaflet entitled, *Why did the Pope not Protest?*

(⁴) Sir Alec Randall, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

(⁵) Quoted in CTS Leaflet, *Why did the Pope not Protest?*

might have been followed immediately by pitiless retaliation, as experience on a local scale showed "(6).

Testimony of Paul VI

Most impressive of all though, is the authoritative testimony of Pope Paul VI, in a letter written to *The Tablet*, when still Cardinal Archbishop of Milan, just before his election to the Papacy. Reference is to Hochhuth's disreputable play, with its unlovely and false portrayal of Pius XII. Here is the witness of a man whom Sir Alec Randall describes as one of the closest collaborators of Pope Pius XII over a period of seventeen years. Cardinal Montini, as he then was, paid tribute in his letter to Pius XII's "noble and virile character, capable of taking very firm decisions and of adopting fearlessly positions that entailed considerable risk". Then he went on, with reference to the attack by Hochhuth on Pius XII's supposed silence in face of the brutal Nazi persecution of the Jews. This is what the present Holy Father wrote of Pius XII:

"As for his omitting to take up a position of violent opposition to Hitler in order to save the lives of those millions of Jews slaughtered by the Nazis, this will be readily understood by anyone who avoids Hochhuth's mistake of trying to assess what could have been effectively and responsibly done then, in those appalling conditions of war and Nazi oppression, by the standard of what would be feasible in normal conditions—or in some hypothetical conditions arbitrarily invented by a young playwright's imagination. An attitude of protest and condemnation such as this young man blames the Pope for not having adopted would have been not only futile but harmful; that is the long and short of the matter. The thesis of *Der Stellvertreter* (*The Representative*) betrays an inadequate grasp of psychological, political and historical realities . . . Let us suppose that Pius XII had done what Hochhuth blames him for not doing, His action would have led to such reprisals and devastations that Hochhuth himself, the war being over and he now possessed of a better historical, political and moral judgment, would have been able to write another play, far more realistic and far more interesting than the one that he has, in fact, so cleverly and also so ineptly put together: a play, that is, about the *Stellvertreter* who, through political

(6) Sir Alec Randall, *op. cit.*, p. p. 17.

exhibitionism or psychological myopia, would have been guilty of unleashing on the already tormented world still greater calamities, involving innumerable innocent victims, let alone himself" (7).

A Faulty Parallel

Most men of good will accept this verdict, if only for the fact that no other, in truth, is possible. Pius XII had no other course open to him. Unlike contemporary progressives who care so much for theories and so little for people, he refused to shout anathemas at Hitler, which he knew would serve only to increase the already awful misery of hundreds and thousands of human beings, particularly those of the Jewish race. Those still inclined to query this verdict which I share with many others, to argue a case for public and specific papal protest, sometimes quote in support of their case the successful slowing down of Hitler's euthanasia campaign as a result of protests made publicly by the German bishops. The comparison, I am afraid, is a faulty one. There is no real parity between the two cases. In this context, they would do well to take count of the wise words of Sir Alec Randall, experienced ex-diplomat and friend of Pius XII: "The successful denunciation of 'euthanasia' by the German bishops during the war, so the argument goes, shows that the Pope could have stopped the massacre. This is a faulty comparison, based on a complete misunderstanding of Hitler's character. The 'euthanasia' campaign, the killing of mental defectives and incurables, was not an essential part of the Fuhrer's design, and if the Nuncio in Berlin pressed hard enough, as he did repeatedly during the war, or bishops like the fearless Bishop of Munster, von Galen, made public protests, he was willing to slacken the pace. The extermination of the Jews was quite another matter. The intensity of his hatred is difficult to grasp; it was a pathological obsession which possessed him even when he was in the Chancellery bunker in Berlin in those last terrible days. Nothing would have deterred him from the '*Endlosung*', the final solution of the Jewish problem in Europe, which he had decreed in 1941, and passed on to Himmler, who had given Heydrich and the thugs of the SS the task of carrying it into effect" (8).

(7) Sir Alec Randall, *op. cit.*, p.p. 15-16.

(8) Sir Alec Randall, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

A Jesuit and a Capuchin

These words, I believe, clinch the whole matter. No other course was open to Pius XII. He had to refrain from public denunciation in the best interests of the persecuted themselves. Meanwhile, he made every conceivable effort to succour the persecuted Jews. Testimony here is massive. That of the Jewish writer, Dr. Leon Poliakov, is, perhaps, particularly valuable, if only for the fact that he himself appears to think that Pius XII could have done more than he did for the Jewish people. His tribute, therefore, is all the more impressive: "This direct aid given the persecuted Jews by the Pope in his capacity of Bishop of Rome was the symbolic expression of an activity that was extended throughout the whole of Europe, encouraging and promoting the efforts put forth by the Catholic churches in the majority of countries. It is certain that secret instructions were sent out by the Vatican, urging the national churches to intervene on behalf of the Jews⁽⁹⁾. In concrete terms, this meant gallant work of the type carried out by men like Father Chaillet, Jesuit Provincial of Lyons, who was arrested and indicted by the Nazis for having concealed and sheltered ninety-two Jewish children. There must have been a good many other priests, too, who operated in ways similar to that of the brave Capuchin, Father Benoit-Marie. The story is told in the article in *Social Survey* to which reference has already been made: "This Father Benoit-Marie was the main actor in an unusual story. In 1943, on a visit to Rome, he secured the Pope's support for a plan to have some 50,000 French Jews transferred from Southern France to North Africa. The Pope helped him to obtain pledges of assistance from Britain, the United States and the Jewish organisations in the allied countries. The project looked promising when it was set on foot; but unfortunately it became unworkable when German troops took over the South of France after the fall of Mussolini. However, Father Benoit-Marie was determined to save what he could and he again approached the Vatican, which helped him prevail upon the Spanish Government to authorise its consuls in France to issue entry permits to all Jews who could prove Spanish nationality. In case of doubt, the final decision rested in the hands of that impartial arbiter, Father Benoit-Marie". There is an important explanatory footnote in the

(9) Cited in *Social Survey* in the article already mentioned, p. 104.

article in *Social Survey*: "Father Benoit-Marie used his monastery in Marseilles as a centre for forging documents—passports, identification cards, baptismal certificates, references, etc. The baptismal certificates—complete fakes—were useful when Jews were seeking to get into Spain. Church authorities in many places authorised this practice (of forging baptismal certificates)".

Nuncios at Work

Despite the example of priests such as these and many others, which could be known by any man of good will, Hochhuth has represented Pope Pius XII in his play, *The Representative*, in contemptible fashion. Sir Alec Randall has this to say in comment: "It is not enough that he made the utmost effort to avert the war, then to keep Italy out of it; that he devoted the Vatican's resources, in money and workers, to assist refugees to escape, to finance their emigration, to get news of their missing relatives; not enough that, through the nuncios, especially in Slovakia, Rumania and Hungary, and through the general instruction to convents and monasteries in Italy to offer shelter to Jews, Pius XII saved many Jewish lives. When the war was over the Pope was thanked by such bodies as the World Jewish Congress in New York, which sent a large donation to Vatican charities; the Chief Rabbi of Istanbul called on the Apostolic Delegate, Mgr. Roncalli, later Pope John XXIII, to express his gratitude; the Chief Rabbi of Rome, Dr. Zolli, was moved to ask for baptism and in gratitude took the name of 'Eugenio'. A deputation of Italian Jews, all freed from concentration camps, called to thank the Pope, who addressed them in Hebrew". The Italian Jews, in particular, had reason to be grateful. Pope Pius XII is reckoned to have saved the lives of five-sixths of their number. It cannot be sufficiently stressed that the activity on behalf of the Jews carried out by papal representatives everywhere was at the instigation of Pius XII. On page 222 of his book, *Pius XII and the Third Reich*, Professor Friedlander is gracious enough to note this fact in a footnote, when referring to the ceaseless efforts of Mgr. Roncalli, Apostolic Delegate of the Holy See at Istanbul, on behalf of the persecuted Jews of Central Europe and the Balkan States. It is a pity, one feels, that there was not more of this in his text.

We need not be bothered, however. Great men can wait on history. Little men can only make faces at it.

The effects of women making up more than half of the labour force of this country are here briefly examined. No one denies the right of a woman to support herself or those who are totally dependent on her. What is questioned is the folly of undercutting the earnings of men by paying women less than a subsistence wage.

Danger! Women at Work

E. L. WAY

THIS article is not an attack on women. It is an honest examination of the implications of one of the most significant facts of our society. It is a plea for men to do much more of the paid work of the world than they do. Without going into statistics, for the moment, merely by using our eyes we can see the regiments of women who are essential to the running of the country. And when I say this I mean that we would be faced by total and catastrophic breakdown of industry, of the social services, of transport, and of our recognisable communal setup if the vast majority of women suddenly stopped work. They are absolutely essential, and constitute more than half the labour force of this country.* Not even in Turkey do the women play such an important part in keeping the wheels turning, the patients from dying unattended in the hospitals, the telephones from ringing unanswered, or the vegetables from rotting unsold in the shops.

Victorian Pattern

And this is not new. In the 1900s, and before, large sections of women in the labouring classes were forced to work because their earnings were vital to the solvency of the family budget. The father's wages were disgracefully insufficient. The mother was compelled to work in the factory until the moment she gave birth to her child. And she returned to her work as soon as she could to prevent the landlord from selling her furniture to pay the rent, and

* Working population : Great Britain—Males : 16,647,000. Females : 8,954,000. From the *Ministry of Labour Gazette*, October, 1966.

from turning her homeless into the street. Material progress in the last half century has been so great that what must always have been unwise is now accepted without much thought as to the implications, and without much consideration of the ultimate consequences to society of such a policy. If indeed anything so haphazard as the play of economic forces compelling mothers from their homes to the offices and factories could be dignified by the name of policy.

Basic Unit

The family is the basic unit of society. Without it we would disintegrate into a lonely crowd of thoroughly selfish individuals. We would care for nobody, and nobody would care for us. The home is the nursery of love. If it is not found there, it is not likely to be found anywhere else. That is why in all the Utopias and ideal Republics, from Plato to Fourier and beyond, there is a line of thought which stripped of fantasy and inessentials amounts to this: the family is the chief obstacle to the creation of the all-powerful state. It does not matter if the state is communist, socialist, or whether, as in the west, it exists for the increase of the gross national product. The family is its main target. In the case of the communist states, as in China, the attack is deliberate. In our society it is not. The family is just a nuisance which occasionally compels the unions to force employers to pay men a living wage in order that they can bring up their families. But the breaking up of the family continues. And men and women of the required pattern are produced. No doubt we shall be better clad, swallow a more correct proportion of vitamins, and receive a finer education, than the abandoned children of the 1900s, but for all that we shall be, spiritually speaking, orphans and urchins: the products of a new kind of affluent institutionalism.

Suttie and Bowlby

The work of Ian D. Suttie, and after him, of John Bowlby, however much it might now be considered old hat, suggested powerfully what has always been known: that the child is "dominated from the beginning by the need to retain the mother—a need which, if thwarted," wrote Suttie, "must produce the utmost extent of terror and rage, since the loss of the mother, under natural conditions, is but the precursor of death itself". And again, "Hatred owes all its meaning

o a demand for love". Today the emphasis may be laid on other factors as well: the importance of society, environment, and health; and this is right for obviously man is much too complex to be explained by any one set of theories. But it does look now as if eventually psychology will prove that love of neighbour is the only condition under which we can live together successfully in communities. Perhaps a few more decades may elapse before it is established that religious motives are the only sufficiently strong ones to bring about such a desirable but unlikely state of affairs. In essentials the pace of progress puts the tortoise to shame.

Women at Work

It will be immediately argued that the case I am making is much exaggerated. Are young children as abandoned to neighbours and grannies as all that, it will be asked? In a survey made of 253 women in Aberdeen one-third had taken work within five years of the birth of their first child. The reasons they gave were mainly financial. Their husbands were not paid enough to bring in what they considered as necessities today, such as television sets, carpets on the floor, and decent furniture. And where the husbands earned least, such as in semi-skilled or unskilled work, the proportion of working wives was found to be highest. And this is so obvious that it took part of a University grant to prove it. And what is true of Aberdeen is probably true of the rest of the country. But, of course, the economy would collapse if all the women went home to look after their young. Here we have it. The economy must come first. All other considerations are argued away, justified fears are put to sleep, and what is forgotten is that our culture is fundamentally unstable. Our way of living is unsound at its very core.

First Five Years

Up to the fifth year the mother should remain the focal point of her child's surroundings. *Her frequent presence is vital.* The briefest experience of children shows that a youngster of three will not lose sight of her mother for days if the mother has told the child a fib, and said that she was only going upstairs, and the child has discovered later that the mother has in fact gone to the shops, if only for a few minutes. The child's subsequent anxiety is much too obvious to be argued about. As we know, the mother is not just a provider of food and comfort for her child. She is the home

base from which the child explores the surrounding world. And if the home base is not much more than a quicksand, how else can the child respond to the outer world than with suspicion, anxiety, or hostility? The development of a sound personality is thus seen to be based on a continuous adjustment between the child and its parents, and most especially the mother.

Shuttlecock

With the mother at work the child is more or less shuttlecocked between grannies, nursery schools, and the mother herself. The mutual adjustment, which must be continuous, between the child and its mother is simply not there. Even with older children it can be harmful for a youngster not to be able to go home from school because the mother is at work. (In one instance I heard of an adolescent girl who was found lying in the street with her head on her doorstep. And it is fairly common in our climate to see children in certain areas running about the school playground in the rain an hour before class begins.) It is not now topical to refer to latch-key kids—children hanging around their empty houses without supervision of any kind—but not so long ago their problems furnished many an industrious journalist with a subject for speculation.

Living Wage

To repeat, women work for financial reasons. If the husbands were paid a basic, minimum, living wage, or if the children's allowances were substantially increased, and the first child's existence was not ignored in this help to the family, the women would return to their homes in large numbers. It is as simple as that. But the men will not be paid a living wage so long as the women are prepared to do the same work for a pittance. As a supplement to the husband's earnings their pay might be satisfactory, but on its own it could not possibly support a family. In the long run the effect on the men will be even more disastrous than it has already been. Their wages have been undercut by cheap female labour, they are no longer the breadwinners, their central position of authority in the home has been undermined, and their teenage sons often earn more than they do. Is there any wonder that there has been in our time a breakdown of parental authority? All this is widely

admitted in private, but when it comes to state decisions, or when the subject is debated in public, the fear of the collapse of the economy, and the dread of unpopularity produced by expressing unfashionable views, are such that the facts are politely suppressed. Common sense undoubtedly exists amongst individuals, but it is notably absent from collective action. Man is certainly not a political animal. The seeds of destruction were planted a long time ago, the harvest of boredom, frustration and violence will continue to be reaped.

Defence of Women Workers

"The social teaching of Pius XII is characterised by his insistence on a *just wage*. He came back time and again to this point. He makes it, together with a better distribution of the natural goods, one of 'the two most pressing requirements in the social programme of the Church' . . . In the second place, the Pope undertakes *the defence of the women workers* and their wages: 'the Church has always sustained the principle that, for the same work, the same salary should be paid—and women should be paid the same as the men for the same work' . . . In his allocution to members of the 1st Italian Congress of Women Workers, 15th August, 1945, he said "It is both unjust and contrary to the common good that a woman's work should be used only because it is cheaper, with bad results, not only for the women, but also for the male worker who is thus exposed to unemployment.'"—Mgr. Guerry, *The Social Teaching of the Church*, p. 86. In many clerical positions the problem is simply solved, to the benefit of the employers, by paying the man, the breadwinner, the same wage as the woman worker. This is not what Pope Pius XII meant.

MONTHLY REPORT

In this the first of two articles, B. A. Santamaria puts before the reader the assumptions on which Australian national policy ought to be based. They are that China will seek to dominate the whole of South East Asia, and that while Australia may hope that the United States will challenge this objective, there is no certainty that it will.

Australian Outlook: 1

THE ASSUMPTIONS

B. A. SANTAMARIA

AUSTRALIA'S major contemporary problem has been posed by several writers in their own individual way. In "The Lucky Country", Donald Horne wrote: "There are two fields where reliance on luck and last minute adjustment are not going to work; these are the fields of Australia's strategic environment and of reactions to the demands of technology. So far as the first is concerned it is just remotely possible that events in Asia will pass Australia by, but it seems insane to trust to luck that they will do so.⁽¹⁾ Malcolm Muggeridge expressed the same thought in different words:

"For 10 million Australians precariously perched for the most part on the fringes of this continent to make terms with such circumstances is difficult and hazardous indeed. In my opinion, they have at most fifteen years in which to do it, and on their success or failure depends, not their prosperity or penury, their eminence or insignificance as a nation, but their very survival."⁽²⁾

One could quote Barbara Ward, Robert Speaight and other visitors to this country, all saying the same thing in

(¹) Donald Horne, *The Lucky Country* (Penguin, 1964), p.210.

(²) Malcolm Muggeridge, A.B.C. *Guest of Honour* Broadcast, 4th May, 1958.

their own way. But it all adds up to the same conclusion—the chances of the survival of Australia as a nation within the framework of Western culture are not bright. If the conclusion is correct, what do we do?

Predictions and Assumptions

No firm answer can be given to this question unless we can at least attempt to define the type of situation with which we are likely to be faced. It is not a matter of making predictions. It is rather an attempt to establish the assumptions on which our national policy ought to be based. To make predictions is a pretty useless intellectual exercise, for nobody can foretell the future. To establish assumptions is equally indispensable. There is a vital difference between making predictions and establishing assumptions. The Jews in Israel cannot *predict* that the Arabs *will* attack them. How do they know whether the Arabs will ever develop the necessary unity, equip themselves with the necessary firepower or even be permitted to do so either by the American Sixth Fleet or by their own present Soviet friends? At the same time, the Jews *know* that it would be the height of folly to build the entire internal policy on any assumption other than that if they *are* militarily weak, they must *expect* to be attacked.

As far as the act of establishing assumptions is concerned, President Kennedy talked simple common sense when he said to the American people on the eve of one of the several Berlin crises: "We must *hope* for the best, but *prepare* for the worst". To *prepare* for the worst is not to yield to foolish pessimism. It is to take out insurance cover against what may well occur. If something better than the worst happens, so much the better. But there is no argument against insurance to cover likely contingencies.

May I briefly state—and then slightly expand—the three assumptions whose acceptance I regard as simple realism over the twenty-five year term. If I am permitted, may I insist on the twenty-five year term? I believe that it is largely a waste of time to say that since the Indonesians constitute the most immediate military problem, the only practical military policy in the immediate future is one

which concerns itself with the Indonesian threat. Those who hold this view generally admit that Communist China is a longer term threat, but imply that to concern oneself with the longer term threat is to abandon reality for speculation. This proposition is unreal because it presumes that we have the choice of starting later to face the longer-term threat. In fact, it is very doubtful if we have time enough to prepare for it even if we start now.

Aggressive Communist China

If therefore it is being truly practical to concern ourselves with the twenty-five year period—which, after all, is very short as history goes—it is necessary to state the assumptions which I believe to be valid over that period.

- (1) Communist China will seek to dominate the whole of South East Asia—and much more besides. The area in which it will seek predominance includes Australia and New Zealand. The predominance it seeks will not be merely or even necessarily cultural. It will be military. And that predominance, if achieved, will involve radical political changes within each country over which it operates.

The fact that the present Chinese regime is Communist is, in some senses, not essential to this analysis. It is strictly unnecessary to determine whether Communist China is merely carrying out the same foreign policy as a nationalist government would carry out. The same considerations would in fact arise if the problem came from a militarist Japan or a nationalist Indonesia. What is different about the present Chinese threat is that China's government, being Communist, has a ready-made fifth column in this country. This is an enormous advantage which a merely nationalist China or Indonesia, or a militarist Japan would not enjoy. Its presence also complicates the problem of Australian self-defence. Against other threats, self-defence is a problem of military and foreign policy. Chinese Communism enjoying the advantage of a domestic fifth-column, self-defence involves internal political action as well. In other words, it is not primarily the fact that

China is Communist which determines this assumption. It is the fact that Communist China is aggressive, as militarist Japan was aggressive. If one could be *certain* that the Soviet Union would become a positive military factor against Communist China, the fact that the Soviet is Communist ought not to prevent Australians dealing with it in the intrests of military security.

- (2) While we *must* act on the assumption that Communist China will seek predominance in this region, and while we *may* hope that the United States will challenge this objective by maintaining her own military presence at critical points in South East Asia, we cannot be certain of it. Therefore we cannot found Australian policy on the assumption of the *certainty* of the American presence.
- (3) There is, however, another certainty which can be assumed. Whether or not there is an American presence in South East Asia, Australia will be there. We are firmly established at the foot of the South East Asian archipelago either by the facts of geography or the designs of Providence, depending on our personal viewpoint, and no one can change our geographic position.

Chinese interest in Pacific Region

I would like to amplify this statement of assumptions only sufficiently to explain the reasoning on which it rests.

(i) As to the first set of assumptions concerning the policy approach of Communist China to the South East Asian region, I accept the broad statement of Chinese aims which has been given by Professor C. P. Fitzgerald in the course of several addresses. His attitude towards the Chinese Communists is so far removed from mine that he at least cannot be accused of partisanship in reaching his conclusions.

Speaking at the University of Western Australia in January, 1960, he said: "It would seem likely that the Pacific region is now considered by the Chinese as a part in which they are acutely interested and where they have a full right of consultation. That means Japan, South-East"

Asia, Australia and New Zealand. Probably they would not be indifferent to anything in the Indian Ocean as far as the coast of Africa. If the countries concerned were brought into the general alignment of Chinese policy, instead of that of the United States, it would represent a vast shifting of power in the world, but it is the natural distribution of power, based on population and geography."³

(2) The ultimate objective of Communist China is therefore substantially the same as that of Japan during the Second World War. Just as the Japanese had two consecutive objectives, the destruction of Western power and the establishment of Japanese power—to be achieved in that order—so have the Chinese.

At Melbourne University in April, 1959, Professor Fitzgerald spelt out the main intermediate step which China would seek to realise as the condition precedent to the establishment of her own predominance — namely the exclusion of the American 'presence' from every South East Asian country. He said: "China will do all she can, short of war, to bring down Asian governments closely aligned to the United States, militarily and economically".

The Japanese method of eliminating Western military power was direct military attack. The Chinese method is the more patient erosion of alternative power by political subversion, leading in some circumstances to guerrilla operations as in South Vietnam, leading in others, to a constitutional takeover of power as in Kerala and perhaps ultimately in Indonesia.

(3) Within the framework of this grand design, Professor Fitzgerald had already indicated several years beforehand how critical certain South East Asian areas were to the military security of Australia, in an article which he contributed to "Voice" in September, 1953: "... While Korea is far away, and of secondary or no strategic significance for Australia," he said, "Indo-China is much nearer and of potentially great strategic importance. The Japanese occupation of Indo-China was the first cause of the fall of Singapore; Communist conquest of Indo-China could be the

⁽³⁾ *West Australian*, 22nd January, 1960.

⁽⁴⁾ *Age*, 17th April, 1959.

prelude to the fall of south-east Asia." Later he added: "... The recognition of China will not put the free world in jeopardy. But the Communist conquest of Malaya might be fatal for Australia..."

Professor Fitzgerald's writing on this subject has the merit of frankness. He at least does not feed us soothing syrup. He describes the full extent of the Chinese ambition. And he tells us that Australia is included within it. If others seek to delude us into believing that "it can't happen here", he at least does not.

Views of Chinese Spokesmen

(4) These general propositions outlined by Professor Fitzgerald have been further developed by two members of the Chinese Communist Government. On 21st August, 1961, the Vice-Chairman of the National People's Congress, Kuo Mo-jo, speaking in Djakarta, indicated that, from the viewpoint of his government, Australia's natural place was not in alliance with the United States but within the ranks of the neutralist nations.⁽⁶⁾ That is to state in language slightly less than direct that Australia must, if necessary, be cajoled, induced or coerced into disconnection from the American alliance. It is not necessary to the achievement of this objective that Australia should make the formal act of denunciation of ANZUS or SEATO. No. The same objective can be achieved far less dramatically if Australia herself has provided a series of answers on the detailed issues of foreign and defence policy—for example, South Vietnam, Malaysia, the Naval Communications Station at North-West Cape—which would lead the Americans to conclude that this country is a "bad bet".

To that point, there is no reason to envisage a military attack on Australia by Red China. The 'disenchantment' of the United States would in fact have been the consequence of the action of our Australian Government itself moving from an objectively pro-American to an objectively neutralist position.

(5) Finally, in a recent issue of the theoretical organ of the Chinese Communist Party *Red Flag*, reprinted in *Peking*

⁽⁶⁾ *Age*, 23rd August, 1961.

Review, there is an important statement of current Chinese military policy by General Lo Jui-ching, Minister for Defence in the present Chinese Government, in which Stalin's policy of using the armed forces to establish Communist regimes in surrounding States is adapted to Chinese necessities. If I may quote:

"The strategy of active defence does not stop with driving the aggressor out of the country, but requires strategic pursuit to destroy the enemy at his starting point, to destroy him in his nest. As Stalin put it, we must not allow a wounded beast to crawl back to recuperate; we must follow on its heels in hot pursuit and finish it off in its own lair. It was precisely this strategy that was applied by the Soviet Supreme Command headed by Stalin, with the result that the Soviet army's strategic pursuit actively supported the anti-fascist armed uprisings of the peoples of other European countries and helped the East European peoples overthrow their reactionary regimes and win victory in their revolutions. This was a splendid contribution by the Soviet people and army. In any future war against U.S. imperialist aggression, this is the only strategy for the socialist countries to adopt . . ."

If we abstract the programme from the Communist jargon in which it is couched, this simply means that should the process of exclusion of American power from South East Asia explode from cold into hot war, any government in this region supporting the U.S. would render its country subject to military attack by the Chinese after the Americans had been expelled.

Strategic Reasons

It is worth spending a few moments to understand the reasoning which underlies Chinese policy towards this country. Dr. T. B. Millar in "*Australia's Defence*" sees the possible attractiveness of Australia to China in her industrial, pastoral and agricultural resources. I feel that there is a strategic reason which is far more fundamental.

(⁶) *Peking Review*, 14th May, 1965.

(⁷) T. B. Millar, *Australia's Defence* (Melbourne University Press), p.59.

It is strategically essential to any power—a Communist China or a militarist Japan or even a nationalist Indonesia—which desires to establish its predominance over South East Asia to deny Australia to the United States, as a potential base against the southern tier of this empire. It was the Japanese miscalculation in failing to knock Australia out after the battle of the Sunda Strait which permitted McArthur to land in this country and to transform the course of the war in the South West Pacific. It is utterly unlikely that Red China would willingly permit this situation to be repeated, and the consolidation of its influence over South East Asia to be kept in constant jeopardy by even the possibility of an American military presence in Australia—whether its policy would be carried out over a long period in conditions of peace or more briefly in conditions of war.

Unfortunately, it is not as necessary for the United States to hold Australia as a strategic bastion as it is for China to deny the *possibility* of its use as a strategic bastion to the U.S. Australia became overwhelmingly important to the U.S. in the Japanese war only after all of the U.S. bases in the Pacific were knocked out by the Japanese. In 1940, when the U.S. still controlled all of her Pacific bases, President Roosevelt had indicated to Lord Casey that the South East Asian area, including Australia, was relatively low on the list of American strategic priorities.⁸ Nor is it realistic to believe that once American power had been excluded from Australia, by peaceful or warlike means, by the choice of an Australian neutralist government, or otherwise, that the Chinese would permit the verdict to be reversed by the hazards of democratic elections, any more than the Russians were ready to permit the “restoration of capitalism” in Hungary, East Germany or Poland where military interests were directly at stake.

Obviously, the development of nuclear weapons by the Chinese Communists will give them a totally new and enormously enhanced capacity to operate in South East Asia. It does not matter whether the Chinese will have the capacity to use nuclear weapons against Indian cities

(⁸) Lord Casey, *Personal Experience 1939-46* (Constable, London, 1962), p.11.

within two years as some fear; or to make small-scale nuclear attacks on American west coast cities in seven years, as some estimate, or to operate intercontinental ballistic missiles in ten years, as others again suggest. The ultimate consequence for the balance of power in South East Asia is the same. De Gaulle decided to develop his own nuclear power because of his fear that Russia, under different leaders and in different circumstances, might one day launch a conventional attack on Western Europe and that the United States, to avoid a nuclear attack on its cities by intercontinental missiles, might agree to stand aside. Such reasoning would be far more valid in relation to South East Asia than it is in relation to Western Europe.

For the U.S.A., there is no comparison between the military and economic importance of Western Europe on the one hand, and of South East Asia on the other. Whenever the day dawns on which the Chinese Communists have the power to launch nuclear attacks on American cities, and such a threat is made to back up a Chinese demand for control of whatever parts of South East Asia are not already under their control, how can we believe that the Americans would *automatically* risk their cities to ensure our security? Under some circumstances they might agree to risk them, but under no circumstances can this be regarded as an automatic choice.

Chinese Predominance in Asia ?

(1) I would suggest that the evolution of this pattern of Chinese policy in relation to the whole of South East Asia—including Australia and New Zealand—is the first assumption on which our own policy ought to be based. This is not a prediction, since no one can predict the future. The direction of Chinese Communist policy is, however, so clear, that it must be assumed that China will attempt to achieve it, if it can. So it must be prevented. There are those who say that if we substituted diplomacy for military preparations we might find that Communist China was ready to come to a far more reasonable 'accommodation' with us than predominance. India, under Nehru, tried this precise policy: the result was not encouraging! There is no

reason why nations which have dealings with Communist China should not explore this probability on our behalf or on that of the United States, acting as 'honest brokers'. If they cannot succeed—as they did not succeed in persuading either China or North Vietnam to negotiate over the war in the South—we are no better placed to succeed than they are. Under these circumstances, a refusal to prepare to meet these contingencies is not diplomacy at all. It is merely wishful thinking.

(2) The problem might occasion only moderate concern if another, countervailing assumption could be accepted—the *certainty*, not merely the *possibility* or even the *probability* of an American military presence in South East Asia, adequate in size to protect Australia and New Zealand under all contingencies, *certain* to be utilised in defence of Australian interests, according to Australia's view of those interests, irrespective of Australia's own contribution. The proposition has only to be stated in those real terms for its inherent improbability to become clear.

In style, General de Gaulle and Walter Lippmann are quite dissimilar. Their doctrine of 'spheres of influence' is largely the same. Briefly, Lippmann believes that the United States has not the power—even if it had the right—to enforce its hegemony over Asia; that in the next fifty years the predominance of China in Asia, and particularly in South East Asia, must be accepted; that, in involving herself anywhere in South East Asia, the United States has made a serious mistake; and that the supreme aim of United States policy in Vietnam today ought to be merely to ensure orderly disengagement rather than disorderly expulsion. As far as I understand General de Gaulle's viewpoint towards Asia, considered as a sphere of influence, it is the same.

Lippmann Forgot Australia

Up to a certain point—and to a certain point only—the policy makes sense for an American and for a European. It is not very consoling for an Australian for obvious geographic reasons. It was really very amusing that our new daily newspaper, *The Australian*, having served as the

high priest of Lippmannism in this country should, on the day after its own publication of his viewpoint,⁽⁹⁾ have suddenly awoken to the implications of his theory. Its editorial, *Lippmann forgot Australia*,⁽¹⁰⁾ was the finest example of unconscious humour since Thurber. "If a distinguished American like Mr. Lippmann can carry on his discussion without thinking Australia worth a mention," said the editorial, "it should lead us to think deeply". Indeed it should! But there is precious little evidence that it has.

As against Lippmann's viewpoint, there are strong arguments why the United States ought not to concede to the Chinese in South East Asia. The strategic arguments are that a series of military strongpoints from Kamchatka through Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, South Vietnam and Singapore offer a means of military containment of China; and that free access to the Straits of Malacca offers the quickest entry into the Indian Ocean for American fleets whose purpose it is to support the physical integrity of India.

These strong arguments notwithstanding, I have not seen any evidence that U.S. military thinking has upgraded South East Asia higher than the secondary position in which it was catalogued at the time of the Japanese attack.

It is clear that the American military presence in South East Asia cannot be accepted as a certain assumption.

(9) *The Australian*, 11th March, 1965. (10) *The Australian*, 12th March, 1965.

INDUSTRIAL ANGLE

The effects of Britain's entry into the Common Market are discussed in this article. The fear that we may be submerged in some supra-national organisation is misplaced. Food prices will go up, and some taxes may be removed. Dr. Jackson also discusses our relationship in trading matters with the Commonwealth, especially New Zealand.

EUROPE AGAIN?

J. M. JACKSON

THE negotiations on Britain's entry to the Common Market broke down in January, 1963. Now, in October, 1966, nearly four years after General de Gaulle's veto on Britain's entry, there are rumours that the subject of Britain's entry to the European Common Market, or at least some kind of link with it, is to be re-opened. Hitherto, the Labour Party has maintained that it is willing to join the European Economic Community (to use the correct title) but only subject to certain safeguards. These safeguards, however, would seem to require a fundamental change in the character of E.E.C. No doubt there would need to be special transitional arrangements, but one can hardly expect that the whole nature of E.E.C. is likely to be changed to facilitate British entry. The Labour Party should be honest on this issue: it should either say outright that it wants nothing to do with E.E.C. or that it is willing to join and to accept E.E.C. as it is.

The Political Aspect

In the past, one reason given for hesitating to join E.E.C. was that it was a supra-national organisation. The Rome Treaty provided for the establishment of machinery which could, in certain fields, have legislative powers for the Community. What many people feared was not so much the possibility that there would be these institutions which would be able to legislate for the Community on a limited range of economic matters. There was the feeling that the Rome

Treaty was only the beginning. The creation of E.E.C. was only the first step towards a United States of Europe, and that Britain, if she joined, would be submerged in a vast new political unit with very different traditions.

There can be little doubt that such fears were misplaced. There were certainly a good many people who did hope that the economic union of Europe would be followed by a political union. This, however, was by no means General de Gaulle's idea. French insistence on national sovereignty has, in fact, come close to wrecking the Common Market, though having come through the crisis, E.E.C. must be a little the stronger. Nevertheless, those who opposed our entry into E.E.C. on the grounds that we would be losing our separate national identity need no longer have any fears on this score.

Agriculture

One of the big problems to be faced is undoubtedly agriculture. Britain and continental Europe have two very different approaches to agriculture. Britain's policy has been to allow duty free import of foodstuffs, and to support British agriculture by deficiency payments to farmers. If the market price falls below a level determined at the Annual Price Review, the deficit will be made good by the Government. In Europe, on the other hand, the system adopted is to protect the home farmer by means of tariffs. The proceeds of these tariffs, with further direct contributions from the governments concerned are then used to assist the Community farmers.

Both methods can be satisfactory from the farmers' standpoint. The British system could be very unsatisfactory if the government were determined to lower the guaranteed price steadily at each successive review. It may well be that if Britain were to join E.E.C., some changes in agricultural policy might be required. This case for some measure of change would be all the greater if Eire and the countries of EFTA were also to join. Nevertheless, it is wrong to think that one can reasonably expect a radical change of policy to suit the newcomers. Yet in the recently published supplement, *Britain on her way to Europe*,⁽¹⁾ Mr. G. T. Williams, President of the National Farmers' Union, seen

(1) *Britain on her Way to Europe*, published by *The Times* and *Die Welt* on 28 October, 1966; G. T. Williams, "Need for E.E.C. changes in policy on agriculture."

expect just that, and that the Community should accept the system of annual reviews.

This is not to say that Britain would not have some difficulty in adjusting to the continental system. There are two aspects of the system in particular that call for careful attention. The first is the impact on the cost of living. The British system allows cheap goods into the country, and high-cost British farmers are subsidised. The continental system puts up the price of cheap imports by means of protective tariffs. This results in a generally higher level of food prices. Estimates of the cost of going over to the continental system in Britain vary from £600 millions to £800 millions. This could amount to anything up to 3 per cent or 4 per cent of the country's wage bill. If wages were to rise to prevent a fall in the standard of living of the British worker, there would be a serious rise in the costs of firms of all kinds, and this would be detrimental to our export industries.

We must remember, however, that in so far as protective duties are keeping up home prices for foodstuffs, the government is not having to pay out money in subsidies. Taxes may be lowered in other directions, and to this extent the rise in the cost of living need not be regarded as justifying an increase in wages.

This is not quite all the story, however. The money raised by the duties is to be used, with a further government contribution, for the benefit of the Community's farmers. If Mr. Williams is correct, the British government would be required to make greater payments into the Community's special fund than British farmers would receive back. If this is the case, it would represent a net burden on the country in terms of foreign exchange, a very serious matter indeed. Whilst there is no reason why our farmers should be entitled to demand that they continue to enjoy the system of support they have grown accustomed to, we should not lightly undertake any commitment that would mean heavy outgoings of foreign exchange. There is no reason why, because we are such heavy importers of food, that we should subsidise the rest of the Community's farmers. It seems more likely, though, that satisfactory arrangements could be made on this matter whereas it is unlikely that the rest of the Community should change step to satisfy the British farmer.

In so far as the adoption of the continental system did

put up our wages and production costs, we could offset the disadvantage to our manufacturers by an appropriate devaluation of the pound. It is really foolish to keep on insisting that the present exchange value of the pound is sacrosanct.

Commonwealth Interests

It has been suggested in the past that Britain should not enter E.E.C. without ensuring adequate safeguards for the interests of the Commonwealth. The countries making up the Commonwealth now fall into two distinct categories. There are the prosperous, older countries and there are the new, underdeveloped Commonwealth countries of Africa and Asia. The problems arising in the two cases are quite different.

A great deal has been written on the subject of aid to underdeveloped countries. It is not enough to pour money into these countries to finance the development of manufacturing industries or more efficient agriculture. In so far as industrial development is necessary, a time will come when these countries will seek export markets in order to earn foreign exchange to enable them to buy more capital goods to carry industrialisation further. One of the best ways of helping them is merely to allow them access to our markets. Perhaps the Common Market countries have not been as generous in this respect as Britain has towards the members of the Commonwealth. If this is so, the solution is to press for a change on the part of E.E.C. The obligation to assist the underdeveloped countries is recognised, and there should be no fundamental difficulty. If Britain is economically weak, she will not be able to go on indefinitely assisting the underdeveloped countries of the Commonwealth. If Britain is strengthened economically by entry into E.E.C. these countries need not be worse off than if Britain remains weak and outside E.E.C.—even if the terms on which their goods enter the Common Market are somewhat less favourable than those now offered by Britain.

The more advanced countries of the Commonwealth present quite different problems. It is unlikely that E.E.C. will be willing to consider special arrangements for most of these Commonwealth countries, nor is there any particular reason why, in most cases, Britain should be unduly disturbed about their fate. These countries have usually put their own economic interests first when there has been any clash of interest. Canada is economically bound by

user ties to the United States than to Britain.

Apart from any question of whether Britain owes any particular loyalty to the advanced countries of the Commonwealth, the present pattern of Commonwealth trade suggests that in fact they have little to fear. Between 1957 and 1955, the trade of the Commonwealth as a whole with Britain increased in money terms by 15 per cent whereas that with E.C. rose by over 30 per cent. Commonwealth trade with the United States rose by 60 per cent, and was 60 per cent greater in value terms than trade with Britain. Australia in particular is developing closer trading links with Japan. The only country that may call for special consideration is New Zealand.⁽²⁾

New Zealand is very heavily dependent upon the British market. In 1957, 63 per cent of her exports were to Britain, and although that proportion had fallen to 54 per cent by 1955, New Zealand would clearly be hard hit by the loss of the British market. Moreover, a large proportion of New Zealand's exports are dairy produce, and these are products which compete with the output of countries now within E.C. (particularly France and the Netherlands). If New Zealand goods were only admitted to the British market on the common E.E.C. tariff and thus placed at a disadvantage instead of enjoying preference as at present, the results could be very serious indeed. There is a possibility that E.E.C. would consider some special arrangement in this obviously very special case, though this is by no means certain since New Zealand produce is in such direct competition with that of farmers in Europe.

British Industry

So far, we have considered some of the arguments that are most commonly encountered in connection with any proposal for our entry into the Common Market. It will be seen that there are certainly some difficult points upon which there will need to be some hard bargaining. On the other hand, there is much to be gained by our entry into the Common Market, and we should try to secure that entry on reasonable terms. Reasonable terms do not mean trying to get E.E.C. to reverse its present policies and to accept, for example, the British approach to agriculture. There remains the question of what happens to British industry if we enter E.E.C. In general, it was felt when

ibid. "Commonwealth little to fear".

E.E.C. was created that in any country some industries would benefit and others would lose. This has always been the theoretical argument for free international trade. Countries will have an advantage in producing different goods and the standard of living is raised all round of each country specialises in producing those goods in which it has an advantage and obtains other goods by importing, paying for these imports with the export of some of its own produce. In exactly the same way, a man could try to provide himself with everything he needs by his own efforts. If he tried to grow his own food, build his own house, get his wife to make all the family's clothes from home-made materials, his standard of living would be low. He can enjoy a much higher standard of living if he spends all his working time at one job he can do well, helping to make goods that will mainly be consumed by other people and using the money he earns to buy goods produced by others. So it is in the international sphere, though people do not always see the benefits of trade.

The creation of the Common Market was designed not merely to bring about the advantages of increased international specialisation but to bring to firms within the community the advantages of access to a larger market. This follows almost automatically from increased specialisation but it is nevertheless a separate factor. In many industries there are economies of scale, and if a firm can have access to a bigger market it may be able to take advantage of more of these economies and lower its costs of production. The size of its home market is one of the reasons for the success of a great many American firms.

All this may be agreed, but some people will object nevertheless that entry into E.E.C. will mean that some of our industries are going to be hard hit, and we do not want this to happen. There is an answer to this objection. It is that we cannot hold back our whole economic development for the sake of those of our industries that cannot stand up to increased competition from abroad. Steps must be taken to ensure that where industries are affected by our entry into E.E.C. the interests of the workers concerned are safeguarded by adequate redundancy compensation and where necessary re-training.

Is the Church for man's use, or for God's ?
Isn't it a contradiction of terms to talk
about "a spiritual body" ? As the soul
changes because of the body's evolution,
should not this be reflected in changes in
the natural law ?

Any Questions

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Is the Church for man's use, or God's ?

THE Church is the Body of Christ, and not for use. It is not instrumental but personal, and the pronoun for the Church is "She". She is not a means to some end but, as Body of Christ, an end in herself.

But your question is reasonable, because the Church is historically an institution, established for the work of the redemption. She exists for man's salvation so that in her we may meet Christ. We are baptised into the Church and to Christ. In her we meet Christ, in the other sacraments and in the sacrifice of the Mass. The Church is the guardian of Christ's revelation, interpreting it for us. She provides a kind of supernatural welfare service. She is not for our use but she is for our sake.

In a corresponding sense she is for God's sake. It is to God's will that she exists at all. "God wills all men to be saved". "This is the will of God, your sanctification". The Church is divinely established to make the life of Christ available for us.

The distinction between the Church as personal and the Church as instrumental is useful. The Church as the Body of Christ continues into eternity: the Church as instrument comes to an end at Christ's last coming. There will then be no more need of sacraments or hierarchy or teaching. Even now the Church as instrument does not exist for her own sake but for the sake of the Mystical Body. Hence the duty of the institutional Church to insist more than ever on Christ and to lead her members away from the idea of the sacraments and even of the Mass as institutional rites. They are encounters with Christ.

St. Paul talks about "a spiritual body". Isn't that a contradiction in terms?

IT sounds like one, but it is in fact a contradiction only if the human body is material and nothing more—and that it is not.

The human body is spiritualised matter. It isn't human until it is the body of a soul; and soul and body are not two independent entities but united substances that make one human being. The soul permeates the whole body, and when the soul is supernaturalised with the gift of sanctifying grace the body, in its own way, is supernaturalised too. Christians are supernaturalised persons, and a human person is soul and body.

Though we know through the Church the essentials of our constitution, we are still in presence of mystery. St. Paul is trying to throw light on the resurrection of the body and his attempt emphasises the surrounding darkness. The body we now have will be raised, but it will be changed in the direction of "spirituality", as Christ's body was changed after the Resurrection. What that means he could not say: but it seems that we are not now what we would have been had there been no loss, by sin, of the effectiveness of the spirit in the body.

There is a passage in the Book of Genesis which should be remembered when the soul-body union is considered. "Then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being". That is what has happened to each of us. God breathed a soul into us: we are living beings forever: when the body goes back to dust, the dust is still ordained to the soul with which it makes a complete human being, and it will arrive to be perfect "spiritualised".

The human body is subject to evolution; and the soul must be affected by changes in its partner. Must we not say, then, that the natural law changes?

THE previous answer will serve as a preliminary to what comes now. We are human beings, body and soul, the two making a unity so close that what affects the one affects the other. The body is subject to change of an evolutionary kind. Must not the soul be involved in the process? If both together are changing, then human nature is changing.

and as human nature changes the expression of it as a law must change also. Is that not so?

Certainly not in any crude materialistic form which would make the body the senior partner in the union. The destiny of man is to become more spiritual, not more material. Man's direction is upwards towards Christ, not downwards to the beasts. "We die with Christ by baptism unto death, that we may rise with him in newness of life." No amount of material evolution, over millions of years, can alter the essentials of the body-soul relationship. At the end of it all, however it goes, we shall still be human beings—living by reason of God's breathing into us of the breath of life. The soul is still the transforming element, and still directed towards life in Christ. Any change in the natural law will be on the way to that complete union with Christ, which is the purpose of his Death and Resurrection.

People talk about "making time". How can one make what is a fixed quantity?

IF it is a fixed quantity, then the popular talk is nonsense.

But the idea that time is a scale marked on the back-cloth of life's stage is old-fashioned and has to compete with newer ideas. Isn't it according to our experience to consider time not as static, a fixture in the background, but as part of every person: and as static or dynamic as the person is? Time seems to speed up when we are active, and to slow down when we are passive. An Underground journey that I make regularly takes twenty minutes by the clock, ten minutes when I am reading, and more than twenty if I can't read because of the crush. One of the German words for "boring" means literally "longtime-ish".

We can make time contract or stretch, and we should develop a technique to help ourselves be the masters of time. Time can be allowed to measure us, so that our number of years determines our age and we look at the calendar to see how decrepit we are. But we can disregard time, or at least refuse to allow it to dominate. One way is to be always alert in mind. Another is to be aware of people, recognising their value. People are immortal, and when we are concerned for them we are linked with immortality. In the same way we should be conscious of our own spiritual reality. The spirit is not held by time but can range backwards and forwards at will, joining past and future to the present. Above all the spirit uses time for the making

of our eternity. It is in time that we unite ourselves with Christ and christianise our whole being. He is "yesterday, and today, and the same forever". In union with him we become eternal ourselves.

Grown men were spending five days playing a game! What are cricketers — immoral, or just plain crazy.

THEY can't be both. If they are crazy, they are not responsible.

But are they either the one or the other? As you know, the very question would seem sacrilegious to many of our countrymen; and it would be kind not to raise it without knowing your audience. Cricket to those for whom its mystique is a compound of patriotism and love of the sportsman legend, is not so much a game as a pageant of Britain, or a liturgical solemnity linked with Stonehenge, King Arthur, Armada beacons and Martello towers. As a game it seems sometimes to be played on the British lines of wearing down the foe with doggedness and obstinacy. To depreciate cricket is to be on the verge of treason.

There is great skill in cricket, and for those who understand it the game is good to play and to watch. But what a time it takes!—and time is of the essence. I once praised Saturday-afternoon cricket to a devout cricket-fan. He shuddered, saying that the speed of it is unseemly—like, I suppose, running during Tenebrae.

It seems harsh and wasteful to condemn a game that keeps many breasts glowing with love of country: but is that sort of employment a wicked misuse of talent, manhood and opportunities, and a neglect of responsibility before God, and to family, nation and world? Six days a week in county cricket, five days in a row for Test matches—it looks to me like a matter of morals. There must be a great many cricketers of county standard who confine themselves to club cricket for moral reasons. They would have sympathy at least with my puzzlement. As a puzzle I leave it.

Don't you think the traditional religious orders have had their day and should be disbanded?

I'VE heard that said several times, and it is a notion that is steadily gaining supporters. Most of the orders described as traditional are frightened by a serious falling off in recruitment. It is doubtful if that fact indicates a parti-

ular unattractiveness in those orders, for the secular clergy are not keeping up their numbers either: but some orders are dying out for lack of recruits and many others are having to abandon positions and withdraw to a smaller field of work.

In this country the dearth of young men and women for religious life is attributed sometimes to "worldliness". The world beckons with offers of free education, a distinguished career and comfort. Parents advise their children to take what the Welfare State offers them, and that, for many, is the end of "vocation".

It can be said with assurance that this is not the day of the traditional orders if tradition means the manners and modes of yesterday. So many orders date themselves by living in the past. They were founded to live and work in the present, and to be always modern. There is no order which did not have an outstanding man or woman as its founder. The orders came into existence to meet a *present* need; and their founders would surely want them to be meeting today's needs in the spirit of their origins. The Council's Decree on the renovation of religious life implies that often the genuine, lively and thoroughly Christian tradition has been lost and the passive and trivial retained. If the orders did well what they were founded to do, they would not lack recruits. The young are not deaf and blind to the appeal of a noble supernatural humanity that mirrors the love of Christ.

Is the best that christian-living non-christians can hope for an eternity in limbo ?

Can there be a non-christian who lives as a christian should ? Ought not such a one to be counted as a christian ?

OVER the centuries, the Church has been trying to clarify the doctrine of salvation and the conditions under which salvation is attainable. In a living Church, theology is bound to develop—it deals with the unfathomable depths of mysteries, and we can go ever deeper into them. Prayerful research into the mystery of salvation has been going on since the Apostles put their questions to Christ, and they themselves answered the question: What must I do to be saved ? Some speculation has led to error, such as the abominable heresy that God's decree of salvation and reprobation takes no account of good will or bad in man. Condemnation of heresy by the teaching

Church, and her continued effort to understand the doctrine committed to her care, have given us a clearer insight into truth. There are obscurities yet remaining. God wishes all men to be saved, as Christ lived, died, and rose again for all men. It is by Christ that salvation comes to mankind; and the means of salvation are belief in Christ and baptism into his Body. But how does God choose to make his salvific will effective? What is meant by belief in Christ? Is belief in Christ possible for one who does not know his existence in history? What is baptism of desire? Desire of what?

It has long been the common opinion that there is no "limbo" for those old enough and self-possessed enough to make a radical choice between good and evil. The "christian-living non-christian" of the question has obviously opted for union with God, and he is responding to God's grace. Most men, it is generally thought, have equivalently chosen between presence to Christ or absence from him.

Is it possible for a Catholic to be bound to follow conscience in opposition to the Church's teaching.

LOGICALLY, it is not possible. Membership of the Church includes the accepting of the teaching Church—the Pope and the bishops in unison, or the Pope alone, voicing the belief of the Church—as the source of revealed truth, acting for Christ. So to accept the Church as stating the truth, and at the same time to accept conscience denying the truth of the Church's statement, is to assert implicitly that truth and not-truth are the same. To avoid that nonsense, one or other of the claims to be true has to be rejected: so, logically, the Catholic in that position has either to reject the claim of the teaching Church to be the source of truth or to conform his conscience to the authority of the Church.

Many Catholics having difficulty over some teaching of the Church, and feeling in their conscience an impulse to refuse assent to the teaching, are not conscious of illogicality. They would be horrified at the thought of abandoning the Church, whose authority they readily admit for most doctrines. At the same time they feel they must be intellectually honest and not batter their conscience into unwilling submission. They think, in their muddle-headed way, that they are doing right.

Others, aware of the illogicality, and wanting to avoid it without relinquishing their personal conviction, are compelled to remove the Church's teaching from the situation so that

their conscience may not be in opposition to it. The only course open to them is to say that what is presented as the Church's teaching is rather a private opinion, not binding on the faithful. They could be right: but an assessment of the binding force of a pronouncement of Pope and bishops has started badly if it assumes that the teaching of any number of theologians is in the same class, for authority, with that of the teaching Church.

The present trend in the Church seems to be towards the individual acting in the light of his own conscience, rather than being told explicitly by the Church what he must do. Can you suggest any way in which we can know when to trust our conscience and when not?

I SHOULD like to ask you what the first sentence means. On the face of it, it suggests that the Church approves of the trend to greater self-reliance in moral judgments by her members. What exactly is the trend, and, whatever it is, what evidence is there that the government of the Church is content that it should continue?

The Church at the moment is re-examining the basic principles of behaviour and the conclusions drawn from them. There is a greater awareness of the primacy of charity as the spring of conduct, and of freedom as an essential constituent of christian decisions. But that concern has more than one stream. There is the main flood, which is in a healthy direction, and there are rivulets flowing in other directions, some of them dangerous.

The second sentence in the question could be thought to refer to those questions, and those alone, in which the Church gives no precise and decisive guidance; but it sounds a little as though it sprang from a background of the expulsion of the Church's authority from the area where personal behaviour is in question, leaving conscience as the sole guide. A trend to deny the Church a chief part in the definition of moral good and evil is certainly not approved.

If I take it that you just want to know how to test a conscience for trustworthiness, I answer: firstly, see if your maturity of conscience corresponds to your age—there are adults still obeying in childash awe and fear, or disobeying in a childish petulance; secondly, examine yourself for knowledge of the law implicit in your human nature and explicit in the teaching of the Church; finally, ask yourself if you want to love God and to do his will for love of him.

THE CHURCH AT WORK

Love in Action: 2

Credit Unions and The Church

J. VAN DEN DRIES

RECENTLY, the Kenya Minister of Commerce and Industry officially handed over the certificate of registration to the Parish Credit Union of Mariira Parish near Fort Hall. This credit union was started by Father Joachim Gitonga, who was a student at Claver House, London, from 1965-'66. In his speech, the Minister praised the Church for helping the people to learn to save and help one another through the credit union. About the same time, the Catholic Archbishop of Seoul, in Korea, addressed delegates representing more than 8,000 credit-union members from all over Korea. They had come together to inaugurate the first Credit Union League in Korea. A Maryknoll Sister, Gabriella Mulherin, is founder and leader of this movement. The majority of credit unions in that country were started by Catholics. Tanzania's Credit Union League with thirty-eight credit unions, at the time of writing, and assets of 752,000 East African shillings is due to the initiative of energetic priests and laymen and to one layman, in particular, Mr. Joseph Mutayoba. On June 27th, 1964, Mr. J. S. Kasambala, Minister of Commerce and Co-operatives, said in his address to the newly founded Credit Union League of Tanzania: "They (the credit unions) are obviously here to stay, and in our Five Year Development Plan, we hope to have four hundred of them registered throughout the United Republic, in order to encourage thrift, to save our buried treasure from insects, and to protect our urban wage earners from (loan) sharks of various kinds who are all too eager to gobble up our meagre earnings". Since these words were spoken, the Report of the President's Committee has been published. Of Tanzania's credit unions it says: "Credit unions in Tanzania, carefully handled, have been a success. At the end of 1965 there

were eighty registered credit union societies, of which we have data for seventy-one (several societies were less than a few weeks old and a few others did not report). The reporting credit unions had 10,288 members. Shares and deposits contributed by members aggregated 1,193,846 East African shillings and there were outstanding loans of 897,670 East African shillings". It is clear, from a comparison between figures, that excellent progress has been made in Tanzania. The same story could be repeated of other developing countries.

Credit Unions are Love in Action

In his encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, Pope Leo XIII encouraged the setting up and growth of societies for extending mutual aid. Since his time, the credit union movement has received the commendation and active support of popes, bishops and priests in many parts of the world. Missionaries have introduced the movement into many areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America, where poverty is the rule rather than the exception. Training in the theory and practice of credit unionism is becoming, in many cases, part of the formation of future missionaries.

One reason why the Church backs the credit union movement is that it helps ordinary people to keep out of the clutches of the usurer and the loan shark. This is particularly necessary in the case of some of the poorer countries of Asia and Africa. The promotion of the Credit Union Movement by the Church has afforded convincing proof that the Catholic Church is a true Mother, deeply concerned with all the needs of men, particularly that of economic freedom, which is essential to the maintenance of human dignity.

Credit unionism, however, does much more than free men from the usurer. It is a practical and concrete expression in the economic field of the Christian doctrine that we are all brothers one of another, and of that other Christian doctrine that good works done by a man when he is in a state of grace (friendship with God) are works of Christian charity and, thereby, meritorious. Under such circumstances, the building of a credit union and the running of it—a task shared by all its members—are rightly seen as Christian charity in action. Admittedly, modern society might consider this too wide a use of the word "charity", but this is only because modern society has forgotten its full meaning. In its narrow-mindedness, it has limited charity to

almsgiving and some forms of remedial work. Priests and religious, who understand the full meaning of the word, will not limit their Christian charity to the promotion of almsgiving and medical work, but will also promote and stimulate credit unions, co-operatives, adult education and homecraft courses, and so on.

Christian Undercurrents

Credit unions, therefore, are a practical expression in a most down-to-earth way of the love a man ought to have for his neighbour. A practical Christian is not satisfied with soothing words, almsgiving, and other ways of alleviating misery. He is satisfied only when, through deeds, he has done all humanly possible to get rid of the misery and poverty, which is the unnecessary lot of so many in the developing countries today. Priests all over the world have realised this. For example, Father Marion Ganey, S.J., brought the credit union movement, first to British Honduras and then to the Fijii Islands and Samoa. Single-handed, he has been responsible for the organisation of 236 credit unions with a membership of 20,000. In a matter of ten years, a Maryknoll priest, Father Dan McLellan founded 250 credit unions for the very poor Indians scratching a living on the bare, cold slopes of the Andes Mountains in Peru. Some years ago, Father John McNulty of the White Fathers, introduced the credit union movement to Northern Ghana. There it has grown and flourished with great success. In all these cases, the very existence of thousands of people has been changed by the credit union. Hope and rightful ambition have come for the first time into their lives. The credit union offers a modern form of living in accordance with the principles of the Gospel. It is a wonderful expression of modern Christian charity, wonderfully suited to conditions in the developing countries.

Cardinal Suhard once wrote: "One cannot be a saint and live the gospel we preach without spending oneself to provide everyone with the housing, employment, goods, leisure, education and so on, without which life is no longer useful". The credit union way of helping people to help themselves is a safer and more effective method of helping one's neighbour than giving him alms, free meals and free shelter, which automatically put the receiver in the position of an inferior. The credit union can and should be a help to bridge the chasm between the Church and secular society.

in the developing countries. Already, it has proved of the greatest assistance in helping to heal the ravages caused by the divorce of man's religious conviction from his daily life and occupation.

Role of the Priest in the Credit Union

Many people, when they speak of the Church, still think primarily of bishops, priests, religious sisters and brothers. They forget the laymen, who make up by far the largest part of the Church, the people of God. When we speak here about the Church and credit unions, we have in mind primarily laymen and laywomen, as those who should be active in the credit union movement. The credit union is essentially their responsibility. Pope Pius XII wrote: 'Whilst there is much talk about the maturity and strength of laymen in the Church, it is in public life that this must be practised and proved. To act in this field is truly to act in the Church, because the Church and the Christian faith necessarily must influence the economic, social, cultural and civic spheres to bring them all into conformity with the commandments of God'. As the credit union is primarily an economic society and, therefore, within the competence of the layman, the question arises: What is the role of the priest in the credit union?

Recently, this very question was thrashed out at a seminar held at Nyegezi Social Training Centre, near Mwanza in Tanzania. Here is the report of their findings, as published in its Newsletter by the Catholic Secretariat of Tanzania:

"Seven priests met in Nyegezi near Mwanza to study this question. Explaining their view, they stated in a joint report: 'The Church (i.e. hierarchy and laity) in the temporal order has the obligation to promote moral values; the priest has the task of teaching moral rights and duties and providing practical guidance. The credit union is one of the means of teaching and applying these obligations'. To enforce their conclusion that 'the priest is on the right path if he involves himself in the organisation of credit unions', they quote Pope John's Encyclical Letter, *Mater et Magistra*: 'Hence, although the Holy Church has the special task of sanctifying souls and of making them sharers of heavenly blessings, she is also solicitous for the requirements of men in their daily lives, not merely those relating to food and sustenance, but also to their comfort and their advancement in various kinds of goods and varying circumstances of time'.

"The participants of the course agreed that the role of priests in credit unions should be that of stimulator and not of technician.

"Father (now Bishop) James Sangu, then secretary of the Social Department of the Tanzania Episcopal Conference expressed this idea when he stated, 'The priest should be the inspirer and promoter. He should work outside, not in the credit union. The specifically priestly occupations lie in the spiritual sphere, whereas the credit union moves in the temporal order, which is the proper sphere of the laity. We can consider priests as technicians in the spiritual order and lay people as technicians in the temporal order. The role of the priest in the temporal order is of a spiritual nature. In the credit union he should teach the people how this organisation helps to practise charity, justice, honesty, etc.'

"In Father Sangu's opinion, priests should not refrain from becoming active members of credit unions, if, by doing so, they are able to give others a good example. However, he stresses: 'Priests should never involve themselves in technical functions, such as those of chairman, treasurer, secretary, etc. Priests should never *run* credit unions'.

Neither political nor Denominational

At the fourth African Conference on the Mobilisation of Local Savings held from December 5th-11th, 1965, at Nairobi, Kenya, delegates from various African countries came together. They saw that the two delegates from the Credit Union National Association (CUNA) were two American citizens and that the Catholic Church was represented by five priests, three sisters and a good number of Catholic lay people. Inevitably questions were asked about the Credit Union Movement in relation to the Catholic Church and the United States. One questioner asked whether the Credit Union Movement was just another American gimmick to fight Communism in African countries. The representatives of CUNA pointed out that their Organisation was on an independent and voluntary basis and free from any political tie-ups. Its origin is not American, but European and its connections are world-wide. Another participant asked why the Catholic Church had such an interest in the Credit Union Movement. He was answered magnificently by one of the priest participants with the following passage from the Bible (Ecclesiasticus, Chapter 39), quoted in full. It makes a

ting closure for this article:

"Heart full of kindness and hand full of comfort will keep
the Commandment,

Lend to thy neighbour.

Neighbour must borrow easily when he needs, must repay
easily when his need is over.

Keep thy bond, deal faithfully, and thou shalt never lack.
Out upon the man that treats loan as treasure trove, and
a burden to his benefactor!

What, kiss the hand that gives,

And make humble promises of repayment;

Then, when the debt falls due, ask for grace, and com-
plain peevishly of hard times?

Pay grudgingly when pay thou canst

Offer but half the sum, and count it a windfall for the
lender?

Or, if thou canst not, disown the debt and make an enemy
of him, rewarding thy benefactor not with due honour, but
with angry curse and reproach?

What wonder if many refuse to lend, not churlishly but
for fear of wilful wrong?

Yet I would have thee patient with needy folk; do not
keep them waiting for thy charity; befriend them, as the
law commands, nor ever send them away in their misery
empty-handed.

It is thy brother, thy friend that asks;

Better lose thy money than leave it to rust in a vault.

Lay up store for thyself by obeying the commandments
of the Most High;

More than gold it shall profit thee;

The good deed treasured in poor men's hearts shall ransom
thee from all harm, shall more avail than stout shield or
force to ward off thy enemies.

Kindness bids thee go bail for thy neighbour; he has lost
all shame if he plays thee false.

And if another goes bail for thee, do not forget the
benefit done thee; he gave his life for thine.

It is right foully done to play a surety false; wouldst
thou treat his goods as if they were thy own?

Wouldst thou, ungrateful wretch, leave thy ransomer to
suffer for it?

Men have gone bail ere now for shameless friends that
have abandoned them".

There is little new in the world!

Book Review

DRUG KIDS

Turn Me on Man by Alan Bestic; Anthony Gibbs,
16s.

"It is suggested sometimes that drug-taking among teenagers is just another facet of current junior fashions, one more piece in the bewildering jigsaw of mod-rockers, beach battles, frenetic pop scenes, sad, sexy, little basements, discotheques, kinky boots, thigh-length skirts and weirdy hair styles.

"'Patience!' murmur the tolerant optimists. 'The purple hearts and the reefers will go away soon. If we ignore them they will join the Ton-Up Toms, the flick knives, the drain pipe pants, the Oxford bags and the Black Bottom in the limbo of forgotten horrors and *passé* protests.'

"Having spent eight months studying the drug scene in various parts of Britain, I find that philosophy as frightening as it is false, I have seen all the symptoms of a sickness which, I believe, will leave a permanent mark on many hundreds, if not thousands of young people in the next decade.

"The statistics alone are depressing enough. In 1953 there were 454 addicts known to the Home Office, the vast majority of them people who had been given morphine or pethedine medicinally and found that they could not do without them when their illness disappeared.

"In 1964, the year for which the latest figures were issued there were 753 addicts on the Home Office list. Most of them first took drugs, not because their doctors prescribed them to kill pain, but simply for kicks. Nearly half of them were on heroin, a drug seldom used for therapeutic purposes. They had been infected by other addicts and in turn they are passing on this infection to their friends and relatives.

"Yet even more depressing than the swift growth in the numbers of non-therapeutic addicts is their age. In 1953 none of those known to the Home Office was under twenty years of age. In 1960, the first teenager appeared on the list. There were two in 1961, three in 1962, seventeen in 1963 and forty in 1964.

"As I write, the 1965 statistics are not available, but the graph is expected to tilt even more alarmingly."

I make no excuse for quoting at such length from the opening paragraphs of a devastating book, which ought to be read by everyone who has the good of this country at heart. The statistics quoted, as the author says in comment, represent only the visible part of the iceberg. Drug-taking amongst the young is necessarily more widespread than the figures reveal: there are addicts who are not included and there are many taking drugs who are not yet addicts. A fair number of them may well be doing so in a short time. Official statistics of drug addiction are bound to rise and the age of the victims to pass below its present level.

Drug-taking, of course, is only the latest of many manifestations of teenage irresponsibility during past years, which many parents find not merely disquieting, but perplexing in the extreme. I am not inclined to sympathise too much with their continued perplexity. They would have reason to expect sympathy if, having tried the obvious remedies, they found that irresponsibility amongst the young was still very much in evidence; but it seems to me that this is just what they have not done. Parents of the present teenage generation, which is blamed so much for its irresponsible behaviour, have often themselves lacked a sense of responsibility sufficiently marked to make them want to give their children the kind of upbringing, which their dignity as human beings demands and which would enable them to adopt in adolescence the first beginnings of a responsible attitude to life and its problems. Parents, in other words, have not understood what parenthood is about. Instead of examining their own consciences, their reaction to the first sign of trouble on the part of their teenage sons and daughters is to blame them for the very lack of responsibility, which has been and continues to be such a shameful feature of their own lives.

This may sound hard, but I feel sure there is a great deal of truth in it. Teenagers are in trouble today mainly because the whole purpose of family life has been lost sight of by their parents. That purpose is the fashioning in love of human beings; a process which lays on parents the obligation of rearing children as well as bearing them, bringing them up, that is, in such a way that they will live worthily of their dignity as human beings made in the image of God. This means the planting of truth by parents in the minds of their children along with the standards and values

which flow from its possession. This is done day by day in the course of what we think of as the family round of loving care and self-sacrifice. This is what married love entails. This is what children have a right to expect from their parents. If they do not get it, then their parents are at fault for either of two reasons. There are parents who know their duty and neglect it. There are others who do not know their duty and so cannot carry it out. In either case the result is the same: the children are likely to be finished.

There are, I am afraid, a large number of parents whose lives are lived by choice in what one teenager described as "this rotten, stinking rat-race" (fair comment, I think, on contemporary Britain) in which material values hold pride of place. The concentration of these parents is on the accumulation of material things; their leisure spent in their attempted enjoyment, very often at the expense of the companionship they ought to be giving to their children. One need only think, for example, of TV to which, in the case of so many families, week-day evenings, Saturday afternoons and the whole of Sundays is now increasingly consecrated. This means that, from a very early age, children are simultaneously deprived of the active companionship of their parents and submitted to the constant pressure of standardised, secularist values. It is difficult to see how, under such circumstances, family dignity can be adequately developed; and TV, of course, is only one of many examples that could be cited in proof of this point.

I am inclined to sympathise with teenagers who complain that their parents do not understand them. What they mean, I believe, is that their parents cannot understand the longing of many of them to escape from that contentment with a dull materialism, which characterises the lives of so many parents today. It is a life unmarked by ideals and in which appearances are all; therefore, abhorrent to the young who are idealists at heart, though often too self-conscious to admit it. It is, I am sure, frustrated idealism that, today, drives a good many teenagers away from home and into a kind of tribal existence of their own devising. These are in pursuit of experience, which is only another way of saying that they are in pursuit of truth without knowing it. They have turned their back on the society of their parents, at root, I think, because—again without knowing it—they cannot take the deadly boredom of its secularism. In this, they have my sympathy. The trouble is that they are without

ue standards to set against the secularist world because they have been given none by their secularist parents, who have built that world. Neither have they been taught responsibility or self-reliance. They have been brought up by increasingly irresponsible parents on the receiving end of state bounty: thus, they are incapable of confronting problems on their own, still less of trying to overcome them. Their reaction to a difficult situation is to run away from it because parental upbringing is no longer of a sort to give the guts to face it. (I am not in the least surprised that pacifism nowadays should be able to claim such a volume of teenage support. These kids are not starry-eyed idealists acting in accordance with a well-ordered conscience. They are, for the most part, running away from the difficulty and danger of war. Children bolting from a bang.)

Lack of standards amongst the young means that they are not only in revolt against the world of older generations, but, at the same time, restless and insecure. They know vaguely what they dislike; they do not know what they want. They are driven to find out in the only way open to them and that is experience. Committed to nothing, ready to try everything; this is the impression gained from the most cursory acquaintance with the present teenage generation. It is a generation in flight, at base and probably without knowing it, from the dull secularism of contemporary society; a generation determined to go its own way; to try everything in the hope of finding (though it would not admit this openly) that which is true. Above all else, your modern teenager wants his moment of truth. Of those who take drugs, many begin in the hope of finding it. This is what they really mean when they say they are doing so "for kicks". It is the same with sex. "We were in love", Alan Bestic quotes one of them as saying, "and you can't imagine how beautiful it was". I am sure the kid meant it. There is hope, surely, for any generation whose members can speak in such terms. In this case, one notes sadly, the speaker was a girl of twenty-nine who had been on heroin—the real killer—since she was twenty. She was finished, poor child, and now in all probability is a cringing near-idiot. I hope and pray God gives her lucidity from time to time in her agony to remember that moment.

It comes with a mixture of shock and relief to realise that many centuries ago young Augustine of Hippo and his pals were doing in Carthage what modern teenagers are

doing today. Augustine knew it all, for he had tried it all. His comment on the often sordid experimentation of his teenage years became classical long ago: "Our hearts were made for thee, O God, and they will be restless until they repose in thee". Here you have the key to what we think of rather narrowly today as the contemporary teenage problem. In effect, it is, more than anything else, an unconscious revolt of the young against their parents' discarding of truth. Teenagers today are angry without knowing why because they have been given false gods. They are insecure because without knowledge of the true God in whose image they have been made and of his Son whose life they are meant to share. They are restless because without knowledge of the truth; therefore, in their flight from the false gods of their parents, bound to pursue others in their quest—again without knowing it—for the one true God. This, I think, is how they are. They will continue that way until those who know God know the duty that goes with that knowledge and those who know Him not are given a measure of understanding.

The Christian task in all this is too obvious to call for comment. The futility of contemporary secularism is too massive to warrant a word.

Paul Crane, S.J.

Causes of the Present Catholic Discontents

During a general audience in September of 1966, Pope Paul analysed some of the causes which lie at the root of present Catholic unrest in some quarters. Perhaps more stress was being laid on personal freedom than on the fullness and vigor of an act of faith must assume in the soul of the believer. Perhaps it was difficult to understand how the object of faith cannot change with time while all around we see the evolution of all human science. "Perhaps the ease with which those who disregard the Church's teaching authority and mould the word of God . . . to conform to their own ideas has tempted some to prefer this subjective method to the dogmatic and objective method of Catholic teaching." Quoting John XXIII the Pope said, "what matters most . . . is this: that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine be safeguarded and expounded in the most effective way . . ."